THE QUESTION OF QUESTIONS,

Which rightly reſolved, reſolves all our Queſtions in Religion.

THIS QUESTION IS

Who ought to be our Judge in all theſe our differences?

THIS BOOK ANSWERS THIS QUESTION,

And hence ſhews a moſt eaſie, and yet a moſt ſafe Way, how among ſo many Religions the moſt Unlearned and Learned may find the true Religion.

By OPTATUS DUCTOR.

Call for one Simon, *whoſe ſurname is* Peter, *and he will tell thee what thou oughteſt to do.* Act. 10. Verſ. 5, 6.

Printed in the Year of God, 1686.

THE QUESTION OF QUESTIONS,

THIS QUESTION IS

QUESTION.

Printed in the Year of God, 1686.

THE TABLE.

The four chief Points handled in this BOOK.

The first Point.

THat there must be some Infallible Judge or Rule to Decide all necessary Controversies, to whom all are bound under pain of Damnation to submit their understandings. Quest. 1.

The second Point.

That the Scripture is not this Infallible Judge or Rule appointed us by God to end all our Controversies. Quest. 2.

The third Point.

That the Church is the Judge appointed by God to end all our Controversies in Faith. Quest. 3.

The fourth Point.

That the Church *which is the Infallible Judge in all Controversies is the* Roman Church, *and therefore all are bound to submit to Her.* Quest. 4.

There follows a Table of the several Questions and Sections into which the four foresaid Points are devided.

The QUESTION of QUESTIONS.

WHo ought to be our Judge in all Controversies?

The Preface.

The importance of this Question, and how easily even Ignorant People may come to be fully resolved in it, all being reduced to four only points.

The First Question.

Whether there must be some Infallible Judge or Rule to Decide all necessary Controversies, to whom all are bound under

pain of Damnation to ſubmit their underſtanding? And how orderly we proceed in the finding out this Judge. Pag. 1.

The ſecond Queſtion.

Whether the Scripture be this Infallible Judge or Rule appointed us by God to decide all neceſſary Controverſies? p. 8.

The firſt Section.

Containing five Proofs that Scripture is not this Judge or Rule. p. 8.

Section 2.

That Scripture contains not plainly all things neceſſary to be Believed or done to Salvation. This is ſhewed by 14. *Examples.* p 23.

Section 3.

By Scripture we know not which Books be Canonical Scripture, which not. Neither is Scripture known to be Gods Word by its own Light. Wherefore Proteſtants *do not believe Scripture with Divine Faith.* p. 38.

Section 4.

That the Scripture cannot Decide this Controverſie, which Books be the true uncorrupted Copies of the true Books of Scripture? And therefore Proteſtants *believe not Scripture with Divine Faith. A Word of the Famous Bible now coming forth at* London. p. 56.

Section 5.

That Scripture cannot Decide this Controverſie which Tranſlations of the Word of God be true; And therefore ordinary Proteſtants *cannot believe Scripture with Divine Faith.* p. 75.

Section 6.

That the Scripture cannot Decide the Controverſie about the Truth of St. Matthews *Goſpel. And that our Adverſaries do not believe this Goſpel with Divine Faith.* p. 89.

Section 7.

That the Scripture cannot decide the manifeſt Controverſies about the true ſenſe thereof; therefore in the Belief of the true ſenſe

ſenſe thereof our Adverſaries have no Divine Faith, nor ſure ground out of their Religion. p. 94.

Section 8.

Diverſe other neceſſary points not contained in, or decided by Scripture. p. 116.

Section 9.

A Four and twentieth neceſſary point not contained in Scripture. p. 126.

Section 10.

By the Text which our Adverſaries bring to prove that Scripture contains and decides all neceſſary Controverſies, we prove the contrary. p. 133.

Section 11.

Altho' Scripture only ſhould be our Judge: Yet this Judge would decide many points clearly againſt you. p. 155.

Section 12.

That Holy Fathers never allowed Scripture for the only Rule of Faith. p. 158.

The third Queſtion.

Whether the Church *be the Judge appointed by God to end all our Controverſies With a Word to the* Socinians, *concerning Reaſons being our Judge.* p. 164.

Section 13.

It is declared what we underſtand when we ſeek whether the Church *be our Judge, or no?* p. 166.

Section 14

It is proved out of the Old Teſtament that the Church *is our Infallible Judge in all Controverſies of Faith.* p. 169.

Section 15

It is proved out of the New Teſtament, that the Church *is our Infallible Judge in all Controverſies of Faith.* p. 181.

Section 16.

The ſame is proved by ſeveral Reaſons. p. 209.

The fourth and laſt Queſtion.

Which is that Church *which is the Infallible Judge in all Con-*

Controverſies? How She exerciſes Her Infallible Judgement? *And what ſubmiſſion is due thereunto?* p. 232.

Section 17.

Whether the Roman Church *be that* Church *which is our Infallible* Judge? p. 234.

Section 18.

In what Court *this Infallible* Judge *decides our* Controverſies *in* Faith. p. 236.

Section 19.

This Court *in deciding* Controverſies Rules *Her ſelf by the Word of God written and unwritten: And why She* Rules *Her ſelf by* Tradition? p. 247.

Section 20.

That the Fathers *Teach theſe* Traditions, *and the* Definitions *of* Councils *or* Church *to be Infallible.* p. 264.

Section 21.

That the Fathers *teach in general the* Church *to be Infallible.* p. 272.

Section 22.

That all which the Fathers ſay of the Infallibility of the Church *in Her* Traditions *or* Councils, *or in general* Terms, *is meant by them particularly of the* Roman Church, *as we underſtand the* Roman Church. p. 291.

Section 23.

Some things very neceſſary for the eaſier anſwering our Adverſaries Objections. p. 298.

Section 24.

Twenty Objections *of an Univerſity Man againſt the Infallibility of the* Church, *and alſo ſome others are ſolved.* p. 310.

Section the laſt.

The Roman Church *having been proved to be our Infallible* Judge; *all under pain of Damnation are bound to ſubmit to Her* Judgment. p. 328.

A Table of ſome particular Matters incidently treated in this Book.

OF Reading the Scripture, and uſing Divine Service in the Vulgar Tongue. *Queſtion* 2. *Section.* 1. *Numb.* 10. 11. Pag. 20.

Of doing Good Works for hope of Reward. *Queſt.* 2. *Sect.* 4. *n.* 6. p. 63.

Of the great difference in Fundamentals between the *Roman* Catholick and *Proteſtants*, Q. 2. S. 2. *n.* 13. p. 34. 35. and Q. 2. S. 7. *n.* 7, 8, 9, 10, *&c.* p. 105

Of the neceſſity of Baptiſm for Children. Q. 2. S. 8. *n.* 3. *&c.* p. 117.

Of the Faſt of *Lent*. Q. 2. S. 8. *n.* 8. p. 125.

How *Proteſtants* are cheated by their Miniſters who ſay to them come with us and you ſhall ſee Evidence of Scripure for all you believe and do. And how *Roman* Catholicks ſee better Reaſon for what they believe and do, then *Proteſtants*. Q. 2. S. 2. *n.* 13. Q. 2. S. 4. *n.* 7, 8. Q. 2. S. 5. *n.* 2, 3, 4, 5. Q. 2. S. 7. *n.* 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. Q. 3. S. 16. *n.* 7.

That the Power of Judging Eccleſiaſtical Affairs belong not to the Lay. Q. 4. S. 18. *n.* 3. p. 240.

It is a Sin to Marry after Vowed Chaſtity. Q. 4. S. 20. *n.* 4. p. 268.

Faith is more aſſuredly grounded upon Tradition then upon manifeſt Miracles. Q. 3. S. 16. *n.* 5. p. 221.

No Circle in the Reſolution of Faith, made by the *Roman* Catholicks. Q. 3. S. 16. *n.* 6. p. 222. The *Proteſtant* Circle, Q. 2. S. 3. *n.* 13. p. 55.

How the Belief, even of Ignorant *Roman* Catholicks comes to be Infallible. Q. 3. S. 16. *n.* 7. p. 224.

What it is which makes our Faith Infallible, tho' we have no

no Infallible knowledge of this Infallibility. Q. 4. S. 23. n. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, &c. p. 303.

Prayer for the Dead better grounded then Baptism of Children. Q. 4. S. 19. n. 4. p. 251. Also better grounded then the Faith by which *Protestants* believe the *Apocalyps* to be Scripture. They were held for Hereticks who denyed Prayer for the Dead. *Ibidem*, the Church shined with the custome of Praying for the Dead in St. *Austens* daies. *Ibidem*.

THE QUESTION OF QUESTIONS.

Who ought to be our Judge in all Controversies?

THE PREFACE.

The importance of this Question. And how easily, even Ignorant Men, may come to be fully resolved in it, all being reduced to four only points.

I. SAint *Anselm* has a very fit Similitude to express, how much a contentious Spirit in Disputing does Blind the understanding from seeing that Truth, which a Peaceable search, free from all prejudice, does easily discover. He tells us, that a little before Sun-rising, two Men in the open Fields, did fall into a hot Debate concerning that part of the Heavens, in which the Sun was that day to rise. They passed so far in their Contention, that, falling first together by the Ears, they at last pulled out one another's Eyes. Whence it happened that, when by and by after the Sun did

 rise,

riſe, neither of them both could ſee a thing ſo clear as was that part of the Heaven, in which the Sun did ſhine ſo conſpicuouſly, to all Men who had Eyes. To our purpoſe. Many thouſands there be who knowing Zeal in Religion to be laudable, and having a moſt prejudicate Opinion of the Truth of that Religion, in which they were from the firſt uſe of Reaſon bred up, and which brings many Temporal Commodities unto them; they ſtand ſo hotly to the maintaining thereof, that their paſſionate Affection quite puts out that clear Eye-ſight of Reaſon: Whence it comes to paſs, that, when the Truth is no leſs clearly ſet before the Eyes of their underſtanding, then the brighteſt Sun-ſhine is ſet before our Corporal Eyes, they are not in caſe to behold it, tho' Men of mean Capacity would moſt evidently ſee it, when they have laid aſide all Paſſion and Prejudice, and with a calm and humble Mind begged of Almighty God Grace to embrace that ſincely, which upon diligent ſearch, they ſhould underſtand to be Truth. He who thus ſeeks, ſhall not fail to find.

II. I know the multitude of Controverſies which have been raiſed this laſt Age, and the manifold difficulties with which they are now grown to be entangled, do make the Search of Truth ſeem an Impoſſibility to the Ignorant, and overwearieſome to the moſt ſtrong and ſtrugling Wits: Therefore no Books ſeem now more neceſſary then ſuch Treatiſes which handle the main Queſtion of Queſtions, upon which all other particular Queſtions ſo wholly depend, that the true ſolution of it does neceſſarily draw with it the ſolution of all other Controverſies which are or can be. This Queſtion of Queſtions is, whether God out of his moſt ſincere deſire to bring all Souls to that happy Eternity for which only he Created them has not left us ſome Judge upon Earth to end all our, otherwiſe endleſs Controverſies? And who this Judge is. For the incompatably greater part of thoſe Souls, for which *Chriſt* has ſhed his moſt precious Blood, being Unlearned, his Providence had been defective, if the means of ending

Con-

Controverſies in points neceſſary to Salvation, had been ſo hard to be applyed that it had been out of the Vulgar reach. It beſeemed therſore the Divine Providence to leave us ſuch means as ſhould be both eaſie for all Men to uſe (that ſo all Men might, by the uſe of them, come to the end which God ſo earneſtly deſires) and ſhould alſo be moſt ſufficient for our ſafe Direction. For, to provide us of eaſie means, which had been unſufficient to direct us ſecurely, had not been to his, or our purpoſe.

III. We muſt ſay then, that God has provided us both of means ſufficient to bring us ſecurely to the knowledge of that Truth, which is neceſſary for the Salvaion of our Souls, and we muſt ſay alſo, that this means is ſufficiently eaſie to be duly uſed, and applied by the far greater part of the World, conſiſting of unlearned People. For if it were not ſufficiently eaſie to them to apply it duly, ſo as by it to attain to that true belief, *Without which it is impoſſible to pleaſe God* (11. Hebr. 6.) It would alſo be unprofitable unto that end for which God did give it them. This is moſt agreeable to Reaſon, and alſo to thoſe moſt comfortable Words of Scripture (*Iſai.* 35.) *Say to the faint Harted take courage and fear not. Behold God himſelf will come and ſave you. Then the Eyes of the Blind ſhall be opened, and the Ears of the Deaf. And there ſhall be a Path and a Way, and it ſhall be called the Holy-Way. And this ſhall be unto you a direct Way, ſo that Fools cannot Err by it.* Theſe Words muſt be made good, and therfore ſuch a Way muſt be given unto us. And it muſt not only be a Way direct in it ſelf, but alſo it muſt be *unto us a direct Way*, and that ſo direct, *that even Fools cannot* (except Wilfully) *Err by it.* This Way was promiſed to be given us, as it is there ſaid *when God himſelf ſhould come and ſave us*; and provide better for our Salvation then he had done for thoſe either of the Law of Nature, or Jewiſh Law. Our labour muſt be to find out this Way. And this muſt not be hard even to the Ignorant. For it had been to ſmall purpoſe

to provide somwhere, in this vast World, a Way, so direct for the guidance of the Ignorant, without the means, to be put in this Way, were also sufficiently easie, even unto them as Ignorant as they are. See my second Section, also the 3, 4, 5, 6.

IV. I intend then (by the Grace of God) in this Treatise to shew that this way may be easily found out, by only satisfying our selves in the true Resolution of this Question of Questions, leading us to know assuredly *Who is to be our Iudge in all our Controversies appointed to be so by God Himself?* For when we have once found him, all Controversies cease of what Questions soever; for without all Controversies we must follow this Judge appointed by God to no other end, then to make an end of all our Controversies by his clear Sentence, Whence Dr. *Ferne* in his 27. Section; *Indeed such a Iudge or Umpire of Christendom would (if to be had) be already means to compose all differences, and restore Truth and Peace.* We will then endeavour to shew that such a Judge is to be had: And our prime care shall be to proceed so clearly, that a Man, of ordinary Capacity, may carry away the substance of our whole discourse, which for this effect, we draw to only four points. *First*, I shall shew that we must have some Infallible Judge, or Rule, deciding all our necessary Controversies, to which Rule we will shew all Men bound under pain of Damnation to submit, even with interior submission of Judgment. *Secondly*, I will shew at large that the Scripture is not this Judge or Rule, which point will require a very full Examination, because our Adversaries ground themselves mainly in the contrary Opinion, and all our new Sects have no other ground at all. I will shew *Thirdly*, that this Infallible Judge can be no other (as things stand) then the true Catholick Church; and this must be also fully handled, because it is the Ground of our Religion; and the true Resolution of the Question of Questions depends wholly on it. *Lastly*, I will shew that all the Arguments, which convince the true Catholick Church to be

this

this Judge, do convince the *Roman*, and no Church but the *Roman*; to be this Infallible Judge to whom all conſequently muſt be bound under pain of Damnation to ſubmit their Judgments, and accordingly live united to her Communion; this Bleſſed Union will end our Controverſies.

V. Indeed this Queſtion of Queſtions truely reſolved quite undermines the Foundation of all Sects oppoſite to the *Roman* Church, ſhewing us a moſt eaſie, and yet a moſt ſafe way, how in theſe times the moſt learned and unlearned may find the true Religion, to wit, by following the Judgement of that Judge, whom God has appointed them in all doubts of Religion to follow. And therefore, in this infinite confuſion of new fangled Sects, this Queſtion (tho' never ſo often handled heretofore,) ſeems now more neceſſary then ever, even altho' I ſhould do nothing, elſe but publiſh New Copies of Old Arguments; ſuch Copies being now ſo very neceſſary to be thruſt into every Mans hands. My beſt endeavours ſhall aim at making theſe Arguments truly publick: That is, to ſet them down ſo plainly, and in ſo Vulgar and clear Language, devoid of School Terms, that, ordinary People may fully conceive and perfectly underſtand the force of them. If my endeavours in this can be ſucceſsfull, I hope this work, after ſo many others Mens Writings will, not be unſeaſonable at leaſt for the Vulgar. But they muſt have Patience with a long anſwer to a moſt important and ample Queſtion.

THE

THE FIRST QUESTION.

Whether there must be some infallible Judge or Rule, to deduce all necessary Controversies, to whom all are bound under pain of Damnation to submit their Understandings.

AND

How orderly we proceed to the finding out of this Judge.

1. THIS Question is put in the first place, rather for order sake, then for any debateable difficulty which it contains. For all Christians, of what Religion soever they be, do agree in this, that there must be some certain and assured means to end all Controversies or Doubts, which either be, or can be in Religion. The reason is apparent, because otherwise every Man might be left free to believe what he Judged best, and so we should soon have as many Religions as there be private and different Judgement. Truth is but one: wherefore though all these different Opinions may be false, it is manifest that, (though they be thousands,) but only one of them can be true. For whosoever differeth from this one Opinion which is true, differs from the Truth. St. *Paul* tells us (11. *Hebr*: 6) *without Faith it is impossible to please God.* That is, it is impossible to please him *without true Faith:* For he is not pleased *with*

falſe Faith. Without we pleaſe God it is impoſſible to be ſaved, And you ſee it is impoſſible to pleaſe him without true Faith. And again you ſee that true Faith cannot be found in quite contrary perſwaſions, of which one only can be true, there muſt therefore be ſome means to know this one true Faith from ſo infinite a multitude of falſe Opinions. What means is this?

2. It muſt be a means infallible as all Chriſtians agree, but *Socinians*. For if it be fallible, all Religions may be a Faſie. Chriſtian Faith is an infallible aſſent, to which no fallible meanes can bring us. This means therefore muſt be infallible. Hitherto we all agree. See *Whitaker*, *Cont.* 1. *Q.* 1. *cap.* 8.

3. All alſo cannot but agree in this, that our inward underſtanding muſt be bound, under pain of Damnation, to ſubmit it ſelf unto that infallible Judge, or Rule appointed by God to decide all neceſſary Controverſies. For if you in your privat Judgement, without any fault at all, may follow what you realy think fitteſt to be followed, why may not I, as well as you; And another as well as you or I, follow what realy ſeemeth fitteſt to be followed? Wherefore, it were to no purpoſe at all (in order to the preſervation of unity in Faith) to have an infallible Judge, unleſs every man in particular were bound, by a moſt ſtrict precept to ſubmit to that Judge. Again he who ſhould not ſubmit to an Authority acknowledged to be appoinred by God to ſuch an end, ſhould manifeſtly reſiſt to be Governed by that means by which the Divine Providence had Decreed to govern him, which is a Damnable Rebellion againſt God; And an Act of high Treaſon it is againſt the Divine Majeſty, to refuſe to ſtand to the Judgement of that Judge, or determination of that Rule which God hath placed, for no other end but for all to ſtand and Submit unto it, that by this Submiſſion, they may be guided infallibly to that one true Faith, without which it is impoſſible to pleaſe God, or be Saved. Now becauſe all Faith eſſentially conſiſts in the inward underſtanding (which is the very ſeat of true or falſe Faith)

Faith) God, who looketh upon our interior Soul, exacteth to ſee in that a ready imbracing of that Faith, without which no Salvation is to be had, and therefore he ſhould not ſeriouſly deſired our Salvation unleſs he deſired that we interiorly yielded full aſſent to this one, and only Saving Faith, which Faith conſiſting eſſentially (as I ſaid) in the interior Judgement, God would have this Judgement readily ſubmit to that infallible Judges determination, appointed by him as the only means to bring us aſſuredly to this one true Faith. Things which are neceſſary to pleaſe God, muſt of neceſſity be things of precept and ſtrict command, even under pain of Damnation, becauſe our very greateſt obligation, of all obligations, is to obey his will, and pleaſure. And his Sacred pleaſure is to exact that moſt at our hands, which is moſt for our good, and which makes moſt for our Salvation. True Faith therefore being a neceſſary means to bring us to our Eternal Good, he, with all Reaſon, exacts of us all, to ſubmit our interior underſtanding (the very ſeat of true or falſe Faith) to the full aſſent of that, which ſhall be preſcribed us to believe, by that means, which his Holy Providence ſhall aſſign us, for our guidance in Faith: that ſo all may be united in Faith interiourly: For indeed otherwiſe they be not of one Faith at all. And hence again appears that this means muſt be infallible, for it is not poſſible that God ſhould put a Command upon all to follow that which might lead to any Error great or little.

4. Out of this General Doctrine, received Univerſally without any conſiderable contradiction, there follows manifeſtly this conſequence, that two Men of two different Religions cannot be Saved, if both of them know what Doctrine is taught them, by that infallible Judge or Rule, appointed them by God to be followed, as their guide, in matters of Faith. For both theſe men, knowing on the one ſide that God hath put an Obligation upon them, to ſubmit to the believing of that, which is propoſed by his infallible Judge or Rule; and yet, on the other ſide, one of them flatly refuſing to believe what

is thus propoſed unto him; this one who proceeds thus muſt needs be guilty of the damnable Sin of Refractary Disobedience againſt the expreſs Command of God, obliging ſtrictly all to ſubmit to the Judge appointed by him, to guide all to the neceſſary true Faith, and known to be ſo appointed: Hence it is Scripture: *He who doth not Believe ſhall be damned.* *Mark.* 16. *v.* 16. And of thoſe who follow Sects, St. *Paul* ſayes: *Gal.* 5. *v.* 20. 11. *They who do theſe things ſhall not obtain the Kingdom of Heaven.*

5. Theſe principles I lay down ſo diſtinctly in the begining, and will again inculcate at the ending, that all may ſee of how high concernment it is to make uſe of this means, wholly neceſſary to that only true Faith, without which it is impoſſible to pleaſe God, and to be Saved. They therefore are in a damnable caſe, who being ſtrictly oblidged to uſe that means, which is wholly neceſſary to come to the knowledge of this only true Faith, do not inform themſelves carefully to find out this means appointed by God to guide and direct all to this only true Faith, either fondly believing that Men of contrary Religions may be ſaved, (which we have juſt now proved to be falſe, except in caſe of invincible Ignorance,) or elſe by damnable negligence, omiting to uſe that ſerious care in ſeeking out, and ſolicitouſly ſearching the knowledge of this means, which they are oblidged to do in a matter concerning a no leſs buſineſs, then an Eternity of Everlaſting bliſs; or never ending Miſery. Now leaſt any one ſhould ſecretly deſpair of finding out this means, and ſo grow ſlack in the ſearch of it, (which is the lamentable caſe of many thouſands,) I, (in my Preface at the begining) took care to ſhew, that even Ignorant People, might by a very tolerable care come to the knowledge of this means; or elſe God had not ſufficiently, according to his moſt ſweet Providence, provided for the farr greater part of thoſe Souls, for whoſe Salvation he Died, intending to ſave them all, by firſt bringing them to the Profeſſion of this only true Faith; and conſequently, intending to

leave

leave them ſome certain means, to come to the knowledge of it, by ſuch diligence as is very tolerable to Humane frailty, and very poſſible to us, as Ignorant as we are.

6. What then is this means? It is (as I ſaid in the begining of this Queſtion) to follow ſome infallible Judge or Rule, directing us plainly and clearly to the knowledge of what God would have us believe, to whom we are all bound under pain of Damnation to ſubmit our Underſtandings. But who is this Judge or Rule? This is the Queſtion of Queſtions. Here we and all Proteſtants, and all other Sectaries notably diſagree. They all ſay that we are obliged to follow, and admit no other infallible Rule then the Scripture, which Scripture they all affirm to be a Rule ſufficient, by it ſelf alone, to tell us ſo plainly, and ſo clearly, all that is neceſſary to Salvation in matters of Faith, that we need no other means to direct us in this point. We, who are Roman Catholicks hold the Scripture to be indeed a Rule infallible, and to which all are bound under pain of Damnation, to ſubmit their Underſtandings; but we have very many, and very convincing Reaſons, which move us to believe that God did not intend the Holy Scripture to be, by it ſelf alone our only Guide in matters of Faith neceſſary to Salvation, as I ſhew by five Proofs in the firſt Section. Moreover we ſay that we ſtand in need of ſome other infallible Guide, to know many things neceſſary to Salvation, which be not clearly ſet down in Scripture, and I ſhall ſhew no fewer then twenty four, all not to be known by Scripture, which does not tell us which Books are the true Word of God, which are not, which are true uncorrupted Copies of theſe Books, which Copies are falſe and corrupted, and in what places they are corrupted. Here comes in an unanſwerable difficulty about St. *Matthews* Goſpel. Again we ſtand in need of an other infallible Guide to tell us which is the true, certain, and undoubted ſenſe of theſe true Copies, and which is not. For, from hence ariſe almoſt all our greateſt Controverſies. Again, becauſe our Adverſaries without ſuch an infalli-

fallible Guide, different from Scriptures, can neither infallibly know which Books are the true Word of God, which are not; nor which are the true Original Copies of these true Books, which not; nor which the true Translation of the Originals; nor which is the undoubted sense of these true Originals or Copies, and which is not. Hence we conceive it impossible for them truely to believe Scripture with that Divine Faith, which is grounded alwayes upon Divine Revelation, and is wholly necessary to Salvation. Whence we hold our selves only to be the true Believers of Scripture; for we believe it with that Faith which rests upon Divine Revelation. Moreover by our Adversaries Arguments alledged out of Scripture, to prove it to be the only Rule of Faith, sufficient by it self to decide all necessary Controversies; we prove that it is not such a Rule. Yea tho' Scripture were granted to be this Rule, we from hence can prove, that it clearly decides many necessary Controversies for us against our Adversaries. But we hold that for our Rule clearly deciding all necessary Controversies, we must have a Living Judge, which the Scripture is not, and therefore, the Holy Fathers in their Disputations against Hereticks, often refused to stand to Scripture only. This infallible Living Judge we say is the Church, regulating Her self in Her determinations according to the infallible Rule of Gods Word, out of which Word She Judges Her self to be oblidged also to Rule Her self according to those Traditions which the Apostles did deliver by Word of Mouth only, and not by Writing. For the Scripture not containing all matters necessary to Salvation; but the Apostles of Christ delivering some of these matters only by Word of Mouth, She rules also Her self in Her Definitions according to these Traditions knowing that those things which the Apostles taught by Word of Mouth, are no less worthy all credit, then what they taught by Pen and Paper. And by the same Traditions She is as sufficiently assured of what was delivered only by Word of Mouth, as of what was delivered by Pen and Paper. Now

least

leaſt that in taking true Scripture for falſe, true Traditions for falſe, or in delivering the true Senſe of the One, or the Other, this Church ſhould be Subject to Error, we ſay, She is in theſe matters, alwayes aſſiſted in Her publick Determinations, by the infallible aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, promiſed to Her for this end, to lead Her into all Truth. That chief Court, in which She delivers to the People Her infallible Definitions, we all hold to be Lawful General Councils, which the ſupreme Paſtor of the Church preſides. Neither does this Church want means to make all Her Decrees evidently known to the People, to be Her true Decrees. And all this, which hath hitherto been ſaid of the Church in General, we ſhew to be verified only of the *Roman Church*; of whom alſo all theſe prime things which the Scripture ſay of the true Church, are verified, and united in Her alone: The *Roman Church* therefore being this our infallible Judge appointed by God to end, and determine all our Controverſies, all under pain of Damnation, are to ſubmit their inward Judgements and Underſtandings to Her Decrees, Neither are they in State of Salvation who refuſe to do it.

7. Here you have a Brief ſum of all our Doctrine in General, and juſt almoſt in that very Order that I have delivered here ſo many important points, without bringing here any full proof of them. I ſhall now proceed to the full proof of all, and every one of theſe points here ſet down, ſo Briefly, to the end that thou mayeſt ſee how clearly we proceed, reſolving firſt this Queſtion, *Who is to be our Judge*, by ſhewing in diverſe Sections, that the Scripture is not Judge. And then ſhewing that this infallible Judge can be no other then the Church. And thirdly, that this Church can be no other then the *Roman*. And conſequently all that hath hitherto been ſaid, or hereafter ſhall be ſaid, to agree to the infallible Judge (whom we are now ſeeking out) is verified of the *Roman Church*, and of no other.

THE

THE SECOND
QUESTION.

Whether the Scripture be this infallible Judge or Rule appointed us by God to decide all neceſſary Controverſies.

THE FIRST SECTION.

Containing five Proofs that Scripture is not this Judge or Rule.

1. ALL *Proteſtants*, and all that numberleſs number of our new Sectaries, do affirm that the Scripture, and only the Scripture by it ſelf alone, is that infallible Rule, by which all neceſſary Controverſies, that are, or can be, are to be decided. As for the means to regulate our ſelves in the knowledge of true, and falſe Scripture, and for the finding the certain and undoubted true ſenſe of the ſame, they make no other uſe of the Authority of any Church, or any General Councel, but to conſider of what they ſay, and ponder how agreable, or diſagreable their Opinions are to Scripture. And then, if by their private Judgement of Diſcretion, they in their own underſtandings are convinced, that, what they ſay, is agreable to Scripture, they, for this Reaſon, give belief unto it. If they by their private Judgement of Diſcretion are convinc'd, that, what they ſay, is not agreable to Scripture, they freely reject it, and disbelieve it. And this hath ever been the proceeding of all ancient Hereticks, and is ever like to be the proceeding of all Hereticks to come. For by this means they all come to that, which they all deſire, that is,

to

to have that paſs for Truth, which each of them in their private Judgements of Diſcretion, do think to be true according to their manner of underſtanding the Scripture. And they all truſt more to their private underſtanding of the Scripture, then they do truſt to the Interpretation of it made by the greateſt Doctors that ever the Church of God had for theſe thouſand and ſix hundred Years, how Holy, or how Learned ſoever they were: Yea more then they will truſt all the chief Paſtors and Prelats of the Church Aſſembled in a General Council, after they have with all mature deliberation conſidered all the Texts of Scriptures concerning ſuch a point, and conferred them with the Originals, and with other places, and after they have examined each Biſhop of each Nation what they find to have been delivered to them by their Anceſtors touching this point, by much Prayer, and publick Faſts of all the Church diffuſed, implored the aſſiſtance of Almighty God, to direct them to the knowledge of the Truth in ſuch a point. For after all this done, and after all theſe prime Learned and Holy Prelats of the Church, have, by full conſent, defined ſuch a point to be held as true, and that under pain of Excommunication. Behold! When this Decree comes forth, there will ſtart up ſome Devout Cobler or Weaver: He will take this Decree into the one Hand, and in the other he will take his *Engliſh* Bible, Tranſlated by ſome Body, (tho neither I, nor He have any aſſurance of his honeſty or skill, or of the uncorruptedneſs of the Copy by which this *Engliſh* Bible was Tranſlated,) yet into his Hands he will take it. And then ſincerely he will make a review of this Decree, or of the whole Book of Decrees, made by this, or by any General Council. And then if after his ſerious peruſal of the matter, his rude underſtanding, according to his private Judgement of Diſcretion, does in good earneſt think this Decree (or all theſe Decrees) to be contrary to the Word of God, (rightly Interpreted by him) this Man, according to the Principles of our Adverſaries, may ſecurely disbelieve this Doctrine,

tho propoſed by ſo great an Authority as I have ſaid, yea tho this Authority, as they themſelves ſay, be the very greateſt Authority upon Earth. To relate this prodigious Opinion is enough to refute it; and to ſhew how far more rationally we *Roman Catholicks* rather truſt to the Interpretations of general Councils, which we on the one ſide find ſeconded every where by the Authority of the graveſt Doctors of the Church of God, according to their Judgement of Diſcretion, and the Tradition and Judgement, and perpetual practice of their Anceſtors. And then on the other ſide we ſee our own ſelves, that all this is to the very full as much, yea and far more agreable to the Word of God, according to our own private Judgement of Diſcretion. Wherefore in this reſpect we are to the very full as well grounded as they, and we ſee as well what we do: But we infinitely exceed them in the advantage that we have, by following not only our own, but alſo a far better ſighted Judgement then our own, even in the uſe of natural Reaſon, beſides which Reaſon thoſe General Councils have a more ſpecial aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt. And thus we perſever in all Ages in all Unity, whilſt they in this one Age have run diviſion upon the ground of Scripture, that the meer relation of their ſeveral Sects in this one Age, with the ſeveral Opinions of every Sect of this Age, fills whole Books, which are to be ſeen in every Stationers Shop. And it is a wonder if any new Year paſs without one or more Religions ſpringing up, as long as this one Principle paſſes for currant, and Men may have free Liberty to follow the conſequences which manifeſtly follow from it, as of late they have it. If this daily hatching of Religions happened not ſooner, it was becauſe this Liberty was not granted ſooner. For altho' their Biſhops held the Doctrine of giving all Liberty to follow in Conſcience what they in their private Judgement of Diſcretion held to be conformable to Gods Word; yet they very inconſequently, forced their Conſciences to an exterior conformity as long as their Power laſted, for fear that ſhould not laſt long.

if

if Men were permitted to practiſe what they were permitted and taught to believe.

2. But to go on more orderly, we ſay the Bible by it ſelf alone is not this Judge, or Rule appointed by God to decide all neceſſary Controverſies, without you take the Bible as it, by many and very clear Texts ſends us for more full Inſtruction to the Church. In this ſenſe, it is moſt true that the Bible is a very ſufficient Rule, as ſhall hereafter be more fully declared. But we deny that which our Adverſaries affirm, that the Bible, taken by it ſelf, doth ſuffer to decide, and end all our Controverſies. This I prove firſt by an argument ſo manifeſt, that, in theſe dayes, he muſt put out his eyes who will not ſee the truth of it. For who ſeeth not now the Bible dayly conſulted, place conferred with place, the beſt Originals ſearched for, and looked for, and publiſhed more than ever (we having the advantage of Printing:) And yet after this; who ſeeth not that Controverſies about the very chief points of Religion, are ſo far from being leſſened, that never was age ſeen, or heard of, in which they multiplied more. No ſooner had MARTIN LUTHER broached this Principle, that every man might take the Bible into his hand, and follow that interpretation, which after due diligence uſed, he thought to be beſt; but preſently there ſprang up an incredible number of different Sects. An. 1526. *Carolostadius*, *Zuinglius*, and *OEcolampadius* began to preach that Opinion of the Sacramentaries, which denyeth Chriſt to be really preſent in the Sacrament (an Opinion which *Luther* did curſe untill his very Death.) The next year after, *Paciomontanus* and *Rothomannus* retaining other Opinions of *Luther* brought in *Anabaptiſm*. And theſe *Anabaptiſt* are now grown to be devided into twenty different Sects all deſcribed particularly by *Spanthemius*. In fine *Luther* himſelf and his Diſciples did ſo tumble about their New Religion, turning it with ſo many Chops and Changes, that *OEcolampadius* objected unto them, *If we reflect upon your Diſſentions ſurely*

there are almoſt found among you ſeventy ſeven changes. Æquæ reſponſio ad Lutherum. Præfat. Their chief permanent Sects were, *the Antinomians, Oſiandrians, Majoriſts, Synergiſts, Stancarians, Amsdorfians, Flavians, Subſtantiarians, Accidentarians, Adiaphoriſts, Muſculans, Pſeffringians, Vbiquiſts.* So much for Lutherans.

3. Now in the year 1538 *John Calvin* a Diſciple of *Zuinglius*, deſpiſing his Maſter did ſet up of himſelf, adding many Opinions to that of the Sacramentarians. This man's Religion, and his Diſciples began ſo quickly to be divided, & ſubdivided into ſo many Sects, that *Luther* did live to write thus of them: *I ſcarce ever read of a more deformed Hereſy, which preſently in the begining was divided into ſo many heads, ſuch a number of Sects* (mark what follows) *not one like another, and ſuch variety and diſagreing of Opinions.* Tom. 7. fol 380. And in another place he adderh, *Six or ſeven Sects of them to have riſen in only two years ſpace. Tom 6. f. 335.* Thus much could *Luther* ſay of their very beginings. We, at this day ſee that his Engliſh Diſciples can ring the Changes as well as any of their Fore-fathers, ſo that now every Family is like a houſe in which the Maſter Speaks *High-Dutch*, the Miſtreſs *French*, the Children one *Spaniſh*, one *Iriſh*, one *Scotiſh*, and ſome ſervants *Welch*, ſome *Japonian*, ſome *Polonian*, &c. And all this *Babylonian* Confuſion proceeds from this one Principle, of thruſting the Bible (in the Vulgar Language) into every hand, with teaching them this principle, Behold here is the only Rule God has given you to Rule your own ſelves by; and by which every one is to Judge for himſelf, which is true Doctrine, which is falſe, after he hath uſed induſtries, as ſhall be declared, *Sect. 2. n.* 13. Though even after the uſe of all thoſe Induſtries, we do ſee with out Eyes no end preſent, or ever like to be made of our Controverſies ſtill encreaſing and increaſing like Snow falling from a mountain.

4. A ſecond Reaſon much illuſtrating and declaring the former (becauſe it diſcovereth the true Original cauſe why we ſhall

ſee

ſee no Controverſies ever ends by ſtanding only to the ſentence given by God in the Bible) is this, that whilſt we take thus the Scripture for our only Rule, and God, as he ſpeaketh by the Scriptures alone, for our only Judge, we needs muſt fall into a vaſt Confuſion. For every one of us having our private Judgements, as different almoſt from one another, as our faces are, and theſe Judgements being ſo very weak in hard, and high matters how can it be but that preſently we ſhould come to frame different Judgements of the true Sence and Interpretation of that Sentence which we find given by God in Scripture, as ſhall be very fully declared *Sect.* 7. Well then; in this Variety of Judgements, you ſay, we may refuſe to ſtand to the interiour imbracing of that Interpretation, which is made by the graveſt General Council that can be gathered upon Earth, unleſs, peruſing the Definition of this Council, we, in our private Judgement of Diſcretion, Judge it conformable to the Word. But if (after uſe of ſuch Induſtries as you require) we, according to our private Judgement (ſo very various, and ſo very weak in points ſo hard) do really think the Difinition not to be conformable to Scripture, then (you ſay) we may Interiourly diſſent from it, and yet it is true that all Faith conſiſt in the Interiour Aſſent. Whence it follows that the laſt Rule which is followed, when all comes to all, is the Scripture, not taken as it ſounds (for that we all reject) but taken in that ſenſe which our private Judgement (for this is your Doctrine) draweth from it. This is that, ſay we, which openeth a wide Gap to all Sectaries, and *D. Fern* in his 1. *Sect.* in vain labours to ſhew the contrary by telling them they muſt bring *evident Scripture and demonſtration againſt publick Authority of the Church, and that upon diſent and gainſaying they muſt undergo the Churches Cenſures*, which Cenſures, according to our Adverſaries Doctrine, ſhall nothing hurt your Soul. And he concludeth, *that there is no other means to preſerve Unity proper to the Church.* But queſtionleſs this means is moſt uneffectual, which both experience teacheth us (as I have juſt

now

now ſhewed) and the very conſideration alſo of the Nature of the means. For this means muſt at laſt be applyed by men, that is, by thoſe to whom Nature hath given as different Judgements in their underſtandings, as affections in their love and Wills. Well now, when this weak, this moſt fallible and moſt various underſtanding, hath got into his hands the Rule, by the which only every one is to be directed in Faith, what can we expect but that, as every one's Judgement is different, ſo alſo will the Faith of every one be. And every one believing that to be evident which he Judgeth to be ſo, every one will ſincerly ſay that he bringeth evident Demonſtrations of Scripture, and therefore he contradicteth Publick Authority upon as good ground as you did, when you (at your Diviſion from the *Roman Church*) did contradict not only her Authority, but alſo the publick known doctrine of all other Churches which God had viſible, at that time, upon the face of the Earth. *Tertullian* wittily ſaith, *what was Lawful to* Valentinus *was lawful to the* Valentinians. As Lawfully as *Luther*, *Zuinglius*, *Calvin*, and others did ſeperate from all the Prelates and Paſtors of the Church of their age. So Lawfully at the leaſt the *Lutherians*, *Zuinglians*, *Calviniſts*, may ſeparate from them and their few new Prelates and Paſtors, and may according to the example which theſe men gave them, make themſelves *Independents* and caſt of this remnant of *Dependancy* not only of higher Prelates, but alſo of all inferiour Curates: for this is but to go on conſequently to the example given unto them.

5. But for the importance of the matter, I will further declare this by a clear Example, which may here after be uſeful to us. Let us take an *Arian Cobler*, and give him one great principle more of D. *Ferns*, *that his part is the negative*: For he denyes the affirmative Doctrine of thoſe who teach, that God the Son is of the very ſelf ſame ſubſtance with his Father; and that conſequently our Church muſt ſhew him evident Scripture for what we affirm. If you tell him, the great Council of *Nice* hath unanimouſly declared the ſenſe

of

of theſe Words in Scripture, *I and my Father am one thing*, to be this, that God the Son is one and the ſelf ſame ſubſtance with his Father, tho' yet he be a different Perſon. Well, will he ſay, I reverence Councils very highly, yet I muſt peruſe their Decrees, and conſider how conformable they be to Scripture. I begining to do this, began to ponder how God the Father and his Son are one thing; being they be quite different Perſons? And ſurely this different Perſonality, in all reaſon, ſhould be a different thing. How then (ſaid I) are they one thing? Is it not perhaps the true meaning of theſe Words, that they are one thing only by Affection? As I been often told by our great Doctors. This I can eaſily underſtand: I will ſee a little further whether this Interpretation, conferred with other Texts of Scripture, may not be found to be very good. I conferred it with the text, which one of our Doctors cited out of *John* 17. 21. where Chriſt prayes to his Father, *That all his Diſciples may be One thing, as thou Father in me, and I in thee.* Here I marked that Chriſt demanded, that his Diſciples *might be one thing, as he and his Father are one thing.* Now every Body ſees, that Chriſt never begged, that his Diſciples might *be one thing in ſubſtance with him.* Hence I manifeſtly conclude that I now am not convinced of my negative Opinion, for which I have all Humane Reaſons; but contrary wiſe I bring for my Opinion the evident demonſtration of Scripture, againſt the publick Authority of the Council of *Nice.* Wherefore if the followers of that Council preſs me to make publick Profeſſion, that God the Son is of the ſame ſubſtance with his Father, I may and muſt gainſay them all. Good M. Doctor either convince this *Arian Cobler*, or give us better ſatisfaction why you deny, that theſe your principles open a gap for Sectaries, and even ſuch Sectaries as overthrow the Foundations of true Religion, as you confeſs this *Arian* belief doth. And juſt as this *Cobler* proceeds in denying this Conſubſtantiation, ſo you proceed in denying Tranſubſtantiation. Only he who de-

nyes

nyes Conſubſtantiation hath incomparably ſtronger reaſons and better Authority of Scripture for himſelf. Of this review of Counſels, ſee *Sect.* 18. *n.* 5. 6.

6. A third Reaſon, why we ſay Scripture not to be our only Judge, is; that our very Adverſaries confeſs, no one Book of Scripture, nor no certain number of Canonical Books, to be our Judge: But they ſay the whole Canon, or all the Canonical Books together, make up the only Rule, by which we are to be wholly directed. Now if this be ſo, that you will have us Judged by all Canonical Books, then you muſt agree to tell us, which Books for certain be thoſe which belong to the making up the whole number of Canonical Books. For it is a moſt juſt requeſt to ask of you, by what Judge you would have us to be Judged? You ſay by all Canonical Books. Give us leave to ask how many, and which Books they be? Your *Engliſh* Bible thruſteth out of the Canon, and places among the *Apocrypha*, ſome half a ſcore Books which we hold for Canonical. Again, your *Engliſh* Bible takes into the Canon of Scriptures, divers Books which your *Lutheran Brethren* caſt out: As the Epiſtle of St. *Paul* to the *Hebrews*, the Epiſtle of St. *James*; the ſecond Epiſtle of St. *Peter*, the ſecond and third of St. *John*; the Epiſtle of St. *Jude*; the *Apocalyps* or *Revelation*. We then ſay unto you, agree at leaſt firſt, by which Books you would have the Canon to be compleatly made up, and then preſs us by your Arguments to be Judged by them alone. This at leaſt we have reaſon to ſay; but we conceive our ſelves alſo to have reaſon to exact of you, to Demonſtrate unto us, that the Books of *Machabees* (by which we prove Purgatory) and the other Books which you are pleaſed to Diſcannon, do not belong to the making up of the true Canon. Yet when you have done this, or allowed us all theſe Books for Canonical, we ſhall not have the number of Books requiſite to make the full Canon. Hence follows.

7. A fourth Reaſon, that many, and very many of the Ca-

Canonical Books of Scripture have quite periſhed, and not ſo much as appeared in the dayes of the very antient Fathers: So that nothing but the names of theſe Books are come unto us. *Adamus Contzen* in his Proëmial Queſtions to his Commentaries upon the 4. Goſples, Q. 4. Sect. 8. does not only affirm, but moſt ſolidly prove, that no fewer then twenty ſeveral Books of Scripture have thus wholly periſhed. *Serrarius* does the ſame. I will give you the Names of ſome of theſe Books. In the Book of *Numbers* c. 21. v. 14. we read thus: *It is ſaid in the Book of the Wars of the Lord.* Where is this Book? It is quite periſhed. In the third Book of Kings (which you call the firſt) *c.* 4. *v.* 32. Salomon *ſpoke three-thouſand Proverbs: And his Canticles were a thouſand and five.* Where are theſe Books? What a ſmall part have we of them? In the ſecond Book of *Chronicles*, *c.* 9. *v.* 29. it is ſaid. *Now the reſt of the Acts of* Salomon *firſt and laſt, are they not written in the Book of* Nathan *the Prophet, and in the Propheſie of* Ahijah, *and in the Viſion of* Iddo? Where are theſe three ſeveral Prophets Books. They are all quite periſhed. And the firſt Book of *Chron.* ends with theſe words, *Now the Acts of* David *the King, firſt and laſt, behold are they not written in the Book of* Samuel *the Seer, and in the Book of* Nathan *the Prophet, and in the Book of* Gad *the Seer*? Where alſo be theſe ſeveral Prophets Books? They are quite loſt. In the laſt to the *Colloſſians*, St *Paul* Commands to read in the Church the Epiſtle from *Laodicia.* Whereis it? It appears not. He alſo in his firſt to the *Corinthians*, *c.* 5. *v.* 9. ſayes, *I wrot to you in an Epiſtle.* Where is this Epiſtle to them, which he wrote before *the firſt* that we have unto them? It appears not. St. *Matthew* (whoſe Hebrew Goſpel is now quite loſt) in his 27. *chap. v.* 9. cites Words ſpoken by the *Prophet Jeremy*, which are not to be found in all *Jeremy* as we now have him. Wherefore part of *Jeremy* the *Prophet* is alſo periſhed, as *Contzen* on this place excellently proves out of *Chron.* 2. *c.* 35. *v.* 26. St. *Matthew* alſo *c.*

2. v. 23. ſayes, *It was ſpoken by the Prophets, He ſhall be called a* Nazaren. The Books of thoſe Prophets who ſpoke this are alſo periſhed, for we find Chriſt never called a *Nazaren* in all the Prophets Books which we have. Whence St. *Chryſoſtom* writing on this place *Homil.* 9. *in Mat.* ſayes, *Many of the Prophetical Monuments have periſhed; for the* Jews *being careleſs, and not only careleſs, but alſo impious, they have careleſly loſt ſome of theſe Monuments: Others they have partly burned, partly torn in pieces.* So he, now thoſe Books which the *Jews* out of impious malice burned, or tore a pieces, are moſt likely to have been ſuch as they did ſee the Apoſtles to cite moſt for the Proof of Chriſtian Doctrine, as alſo it appears by their making away the Prophets Books cited by St. *Matthew.* See St. *Juſtin* againſt *Tryphon*, ſhewing that the *Jews* did make away many Books of the old Teſtament, that the new might not ſeem to agree with it, as it ſhould.

8. Well then by all this it is manifeſt that many, and very many Books of Scripture have quite periſhed, beſides thoſe many which you your ſelves thurſt unjuſtly out of your Bible. Will you have us now, in all our Controverſies about neceſſary points, be wholly Judged *by all* the Books of the Scripture? Then bring them forth *all*, that we may know what is written *in all* of them. For who can doubt but many things, as neceſſary as others that are in the Books we have, were written in theſe Books which we have not? Eſpecially the *Jews* malitiouſly being moſt likely to have deſtroyed thoſe Books firſt, which contained the moſt clear places for our Religion. Where is it written that all things neceſſary to be believed, be written in the Books which we now have? Cite me a Text proving this, and I have done. Nay you your ſelves teach, that all the whole Body of the Books of Scripture is required, to give us thoſe points which are neceſſary to Salvation: And the Reaſon is, becauſe you cannot aſſign any particular Books, or particular number of particular Books, con-

containing clearly all theſe neceſſary points. Yea, we ſhall prove, that there are no fewer then twenty four neceſſary points, which are not contained in any of thoſe Books of Scripture which we have, whether they were contained in the Books which have periſhed, no man but a Prophet can tell; or if they were, then (now at leaſt) ſince they are periſhed, we cannot know theſe neceſſary points by them. Yet, theſe points being neceſſary to be known, God muſt provide us of ſome other means to know them.

9. A fifth Reaſon. If either all the Books of Scripture, or ſome particular number of them, had contained the only neceſſary direction, for every Man to guide himſelf by, in all points neceſſary to Salvation, it cannot be doubted but the Apoſtles, who ſpent all their Labours and Lives, in ſeeking the Salvation of Souls, and who knew very well that, on the one ſide true Faith in matters neceſſary for belief and practice, was wholly neceſſary to the Salvation of every one; and knew alſo on the other ſide (as you muſt ſay) that the only means, appointed by God for their neceſſary direction in this neceſſary Faith, was the Scripture, and nothing but the Scripture, by which every Man was to Judge for himſelf; it cannot, I ſay, be doubted but they (had this been true) would either themſelves have procured, the Scriptures to be put into ſuch Tongues and Languages, as the vulgar People of ſo many different Nations uſe, and only underſtand; for without their underſtanding the Scriptures, it is impoſſible to direct themſelves by them: And without they direct themſelves by them, it is impoſſible to be rightly directed to the knowledge of that Faith, without which it is impoſſible to pleaſe God. The Apoſtles knew this to the full as well all you, if it be true; And yet we could never hear, that they took ſo much as the leaſt care by themſelves, or charged their Succeſſors to take the leaſt care, to turn the Scripture, either all, or that part which is ſo wholly neceſſary, into ſuch Languages as the ſeveral People of theſe ſeveral Nations (which they converted) did uſe:

Neither could we ever hear, that their Succeſſors (ſo very well inſtructed by them) did ever take the leaſt care to do this, ſo wholly neceſſary to be done, if your Doctrine be true. Yet you all deny, that their immediate Succeſſors did ſet forth our Latin vulgar Edition, which is the moſt antient of all Latin Editions; St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*, living ſo long in *Rome*, cauſed no part of the Bible to be tranſlated into the *Romiſh* Language: Yea St. *Paul* writes to them in Greek.

10. Some anſwer, that the Apoſtles took this care, becauſe they writ the greateſt part of the New Teſtament in Greek. And then, they being put to prove that Greek was underſtood either by all, or by the greater part of the World, they prove this moſt pittifully, by only citing *Tully pro Archia Poëta* ſaying, *Græca omnibus fere gentibus leguntur. Greek is read almoſt in all Nations.* I anſwer, that as we commonly ſay, that *Tully* and *Virgil* in Latin, are read in all Nations; and yet our meaning only is, that the more Learned ſort in all Nations read theſe Latin Books: So, in this ſence, *Tully* may ſo much the eaſier be ſuppoſed to have ſaid, Greek was read *almoſt* in all Nations, becauſe he added the Word *almoſt* even then, when he delivered this his ſaying in an encomiſtical Oration, in which Orators make freeſt uſe of Amplifications, and Hyperbolical Exaggerations, ever without any reſtrictions at all; eſpecially when ſuch Amplifications be for their turn, as here it was for *Tully* his turn, becauſe he was to ſhew that this Man (tho a Greek Poët) could by his Greek Poetry make the *Romans* Famous, Greek Poets being read, by the Learned ſort of the Neighbouring Nations, and the ſame among the Learned of thoſe Nations being chiefly to be regarded. And either in this uſual ſenſe, *Tully* muſt be underſtood; or elſe flat Scripture muſt be denied. For the Scripture *Act.* 2. intending on ſet purpoſe to give us the Names of ſeveral People whoſe Languages were all different one from another, at the begining of the Church, nameth, *Pontus*, *Cappadocia*, *Aſia* (minor) *Phryzia*, *Pamphilia*, all

all which places are ſituated between that City, which now we call *Conſtantinople*, and the City of *Antioch*, in which Town *Tully* ſaith that Poët, which he undertook to praiſe, was born. Within that compaſs alſo is *Galatia*, which St. *Jerome* teſtifies to have had a Language ſomewhat like that of *Trevers*. Now, if even in theſe places, where a Man, by *Tully* his Words, would moſt imagine the Greek Tongue to be the Vulgar Language, it is manifeſt (by Scripture it ſelf) that it was not ſo; ſurely we have all Reaſon to imagin, that in remoter parts, both in Eaſt, Weſt, North, and South, it was in few places the vulgar Language in reſpect of the far greater part of the World. Call here to mind how much you uſe to cry out againſt us, for uſing our common publick Prayer in Latin, tho' this Language, be ſo common among all well bred People; and yet this our Common publick Prayer is a thing only offered to God, for the People of all Nations; and not a thing ſpoken to the People of all Nations, for their neceſſary Inſtruction, as you ſay all the Scripture was. And moreover *Maſs* is offered up by a Prieſt, who underſtands the Language in which he offers up theſe publick Prayers: But the Scripture, eſpecially the New Teſtament, is delivered to every one of the People (as you teach) for every one to judge by it for himſelf, what is neceſſary for him to believe, and to do, to work his Salvation; and this is his neceſſary direction appointed by God to be ſo. Why then do you not cry out much more againſt the Apoſtles, and their ill inſtructing their Succeſſors in ſo important a point, as was the communicating or delivering to the People of all Nations, in ſuch Languages as were known to all Nations vulgarly and commonly, that very Rule of Faith, ſo wholly neceſſary for their direction, that all other means are accounted by you fallible, and conſequently unſufficient to bring forth an infallible aſcent, ſuch an one as true ſaving Faith muſt be. But the truth is, that the Apoſtles knew well enough, that oral Tradition, joyned to the daily Profeſſion of the Faith ſo delivered,

ed, and to the daily practiſe, anſwerable to what they ſo Profeſſed, would abundantly ſuffice for the ſufficient communicating of Gods infallible Word to all Nations.

11. All this is confirmed by this demonſtration. The Jews in their Captivity at *Babilon* did wholly looſe the *vulgar* uſe, and knowledge of the old Hebrew tongue in which the Law and Prophets were written, and ever after ſpoke *Syriack*, a Language mixt with *Hebrew* and *Chaldean*, and wonderful few by their Private ſtudy did ſo much as underſtand *Hebrew*. This is teſtified by your own greateſt Doctors of Antiquity, who now are ſetting forth that admirable Bible at *London* (of which I ſhall ſpeak *Sect.* 4. *n.* 8.) in their introduction they ſay: *Certum eſt ante Chriſtum nullam fuiſſe verſionem Syram. It is certain that before Chriſt's time* (and ſome time after) there was no ſcripture tranſlated into the *Syriack* Language. So that for fourteen Generations the Jews had not the Bible in their own vulgar Language but the Law and Prophets were read in their Synagogue, and the Pſalms were ſung, in a Language which the People no more underſtood then they now underſtand Latin. This was done before Chriſts own Eyes, and he never found fault with it. An evident proof of the Lawfulneſs of Prayer in an unknown tongne and that God gave not the Jews the Scripture only, for their Rule or Judge: For then it would have been Judged neceſſarly to have been tranſlated into *Syriack*; the only tongue they underſtood. Let us go on. Yet before we proceed, let us note by the way; how ſoon you came to call your publick ſervice into queſtion, when once you had got it in your vulgar Language every vulgar fellow preſumes to cenſure it; yea it hath in your Courts been araigned and condemmed: And is ſo vulgarly contemned that ſcarce any Miniſter dares offer to read it. But we muſt proceed to other Matters.

SEC.

SECTION II.

A SIXTH ARGUMENT.

That Scripture contains not plainly all things neceſſary to be believed, or done to Salvation.

This is here ſhewed by 14. Examples.

DOctor *Ferne* in his *Sect.* 22. tells us. *That Scripture contains all things of themſelves neceſſary to be believed or done to Salvation: Not expreſly and in ſo many Words, but either ſo, or elſe deducible, thence by evident and ſufficient conſequence.* And in his *Sect.* 26. *What is neceſſary to life and Faith is for the moſt part plainly ſet down.* I ſuppoſe he ſayeth it is ſo, for the moſt part, becauſe ſometimes it is only deducible *by conſequence*, which muſt be evident and clear; as a little after he ſayes. And yet for fear all this ſhould come ſhort, he preſently adds that things thus neceſſary *are not deducible, all by every one that reads: But it is enough if done by the Paſtors and Guides which God appointed in his Church to that purpoſe, uſing the means that are needful to that purpoſe; ſuch as is attention and diligence in ſearch of the Scripture, collation of places, and obſerving the connections, alſo ſincerity and impartiality in the collection or deduction which they make, alſo Prayer and Devotion for aſſiſtance in the Work.* So he; very diſcomfortably for the far greater part of the World, who (tho' moſt unlearned) are moſt prepoſterouſly by Proteſtant Doctors invited, yea declared to be commanded, to read the Scriptures, to the end they may plainly know by themſelves what is neceſſary for them to be believed and done to Salvation; and yet here they are plainly told that

theſe

theſe neceſſary things are not all, but only *for the moſt part*, plainly ſet down, and tho' they be deducible from Scripture, *yet they be not all deducible by every one that Reads; but it is enough if done by their Paſtors and Guides*. What by them all? No, not by them all, but only *ſuch as have uſed all theſe great diligences* here expreſſed: To which he ought to have added ſeveral things more, as perfect skill in Greek, and Hebrew, with the peruſal of the true and certainly true Originals: Which diligences, with all theſe conditions, one Miniſter amongſt one hundred uſes not, and thoſe who have uſed it, cannot be evidently known by the People to have uſed them; and tho' they could be known to have done ſo, yet they ſhould be known to have uſed means that are fallible. How then grow theſe conſequences to be *evident?* Yet all the People are all to hold ſuch conſequences evidently deduced; and yet without they themſelves uſe theſe means (impoſſible unto them) they cannot know the evidence of this deduction. For how ſhould they know it evidently? And yet again, theſe poor good People are moſt prepoſterouſly taught, to prefer the Doctrine of their Miniſters, thus and only thus deduced, (even according to their own confeſſion) before the quite contrary conſequences deduced by incomparable better means: For what our Church teaches in Her General Councils, is deduced from Gods Word by moſt skillfull and moſt learned Prelates, aſſembled from all parts of the World, bringing with them the beſt Schollers that can be got by them in the World: All chiefly having regard to what was firſt delivered with their firſt Faith. Moreover all the Chriſtian World is ſtill helping them by their Prayers all the time they are Aſſembled. Again the very conference of ſuch Men with one an other, is a thing wonderfully helping to the finding out Truth; to ſay nothing of the Supernatural aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, made far ſurer, by promiſe of Chriſt, to them, then to any private Miniſters: What then more unreaſonable then to forſake them to follow theſe?

2. But let us go on. The World conſiſts of People, commonly not very Learned: For theſe Men, God muſt have provided ſome way, to know clearly what they are oblidged to Believe, and to do for their Salvation. For many things which are to be believed, are moſt hard to underſtand: And many things muſt be practiſed, which are very hard to be done. And the belief and practice of theſe things muſt oblige all the World, as long as the ſame ſhall continue. Now to oblige all for ever to this without giving them means to know plainly and clearly, what they ſhould believe or do, had been a thing unreaſonable, in ſo ſweet a Providence, as that of our Heavenly Father is. This obligation then in every particular point which is neceſſarily to be believed, and done by us, for obtaining Heaven and avoiding Hell, muſt be clearly intimated to us all, even in all, and every one of theſe particulars. The means, by which this is only to be done, is the Scripture taken by it ſelf alone, as all you Proteſtants teach: Wherefore an unavoidable neceſſity doth fall upon you, to affirm; *that all things neceſſary to be believed, or done, are plainly ſet down in Scripture:* And conſequently what is not ſo delivered, is thereby ſufficiently ſignified not to be neceſſary. As for your limitations, in declaring theſe Words, *plainly ſet down*, we ſhall (beſides what we have already ſaid) ſay much more in the end of this Section, and *Sect* 7. Now we muſt give a diſtinct Declaration of this *your* Opinion, which perforce muſt be held by all kind of Proteſtants; for neceſſity enforces them, who diſagree ſo often, here wholly to agree. Firſt then let us declare thoſe firſt Words of their aſſertion: *All things neceſſary to be believed, or done.* Theſe Words muſt of neceſſity be underſtood ſo, that all things are plainly ſet down in Scripture, which are thus neceſſary: *Firſt*, to the univerſal Church, as it is a Community; *Secondly*, all things which are neceſſary to all ſuch States and Degrees, as muſt needs be in ſo vaſtly diffuſed a Community; And *Thirdly*, all things which are thus neceſſary, to every ſingle Perſon, bound to be

of this Community. As for the *first*; the Church being intended by Chriſt to be a Commuuity diffuſed through the whole World, and intended to be continued to the end of the World; ſuch a Community as this is, muſt by infallible Authority be plainly told many things, wholly neceſſary for her direction, and perpetual preſervation, which no one of you can ſhew to be plainly ſet down in Scripture.

3. As firſt; She muſt by infallible Authority be plainly told in what manner She is, in all times and places, to be provided of Lawful Paſtors, and that with perpetual Succeſſion? As whether it be in Her power only, to appoint the manner of chooſing theſe Paſtors? Or they may be appointed Her by meer Lay-Men, having ſecular Authority: And that, whether this ſecular Authority be Lawfully obtained, or Unlawfully uſurped? The knowledge of this is neceſſary: For we are bidden, not to hear thoſe Paſtors which enter not by the Door.

4. Secondly; in like manner, She muſt be told, what Power theſe Paſtors have in reſpect of one an other; wheter there be one, or none at all, to have Supreme Authority over the reſt? And who they be? Or whether they be all equal, ſo that the one cannot be judged, corrected, or depoſed by the other, or by the ſecular Magiſtrate? Or how many of theſe Paſtors, muſt concur to the Lawful Judging, correcting, or depoſing of theſe Paſtors? Paſtors have ſuch a main influence into their Flocks, that in ſo vaſt a Community, ſcarce any thing is more neceſſary, then due and Lawful ſubordination among them, legally appointed, legally obſerved. What plain Texts of Scripture tells Her how this is to be done?

5. Thirdly; in like manner, She muſt be told, what Power theſe Paſtors have over the Lay-Men, be they Emperours, Kings, or other Magiſtrates, or Common People? What Laws any of theſe Paſtors ſeverally taken can make? And how ſtrictly theſe Laws oblige? How juſt the Cenſures are, which are impoſed for the breach of them? All which things

are

are of apparent neceſſity for the direction of the Church, that every one of theſe Paſtors may know what in Conſcience he can, and ought to do, not to exceed his Power, or not to be defective in his Duty.

6. Fourthly; She muſt in like manner be told that which ſo mainly concerns Her, in point of Univerſal Government, by the higheſt Tribunal upon Earth; which Tribunal *Proteſtants* acknowledge to be Lawful General Councels, and then National Councels. For upon the Lawfulneſs of National Councels, and upon their legal Power (even in matters of making ſo great a change of Religion, as was made, by bringing in *Proteſtant Religion*, in place of the *Roman Faith*, and dividing from the whole World) depends wholly the Lawfulneſs of the *Engliſh* diviſion from the Church of *Rome*, according to the great Defenders thereof D. *Hammond* and D. *Ferne*, who *Sect.* 9. ſayes; *A National Church hath its Judgement within it ſelf, for the receiving, and holding the definitions and practices of the Church General: And may have poſſibly juſt cauſe of diſſenting* (he means in matters of Faith) *and reforming; and can do it regularly, according to the way of the Church by Provincial Synods. And this is conſiderable in the* Engliſh Reformation. So he here; and again more fully in his new Book. *c.* 1. *num.* 24. *againſt* D. *Champny*. A ſtrange, though a neceſſary contradiction, in places ſo very near of ſo ſmall a Book, to lay for one ground of their Faith; *that all things neceſſary muſt be evidently deduced from Scripture*; and that, *againſt publick Authority, evident Demonſtration of Scripture muſt be brought in points of diſſent* (as I ſhewed out of his 13. *Sect.*) And yet here to make this Authority of a National Synod to be ſo very great, without ſhewing any ſingle Text of Scripture, ſo much as obſcurely intimating any ſuch thing: Yea a Doctor could not but evidently know that in all Scripture, there is no where any mention of the Authority of National Synods, eſpecially in ſo mainly important matters for the Salvation of a whole Nation. Alſo a Doctor could not

but know that neither the Name of ſuch a Synod, nor the thing ſignified by this name, were ſo much as contained in the Bible. What then is this but to ſpeak juſt what is for the preſent turn? Mr. Doctor this Authority of National Synods, being made by you the Foundation of your regularly Reforming, (tho' perhaps out of Policy to oppoſe thoſe daily born Sects) ſhould have been proved by you, by evident Demonſtration of Scripture, to be ſo great, that it may Lawfully ſtand in oppoſition to all Churches upon the Face of the whole Earth. Now as the Salvation of a whole Nation is ſo nearly concerned in the true, or uſurped Authority of a National Synod, or Councel; ſo the Salvation of all Nations is no leſs concerned in the true, or uſurped Authority of a General Council: And yet *firſt*, the Scripture neither tells you, who muſt of neceſſity be called to this Councel, to make the calling Lawful? *Nor ſecondly*, who muſt of neceſſity be Aſſembled, to make the Aſſembly full and Lawful? Or how many may ſuffice? *Nor thirdly*, who, or how many of thoſe, who are Aſſembled, muſt conſent to the voting of a Decree, or Definition before it obliges? *Nor fourthly*, who muſt call theſe Men? Or what Power he hath to force them by Cenſures to appear at the time and place appointed, and to continue there? Or whether any one be bound to come, except thoſe who pleaſe, and when they pleaſe? *Nor fifthly*, who muſt preſide in this Aſſembly? *Nor ſixthly*, what Power this Aſſembly hath to declare all doubts in Faith? Or whether it can impoſe precepts under pain of Damnation? For example, commanding all under this penalty to keep *Chriſtmas-Day*, *Aſſenſion-Day*, and to Communicate once a Year, to Faſt on *Chriſtmas-Eve*, yea to Faſt a *whole Lent*? Or whether, after all their Decrees, every one, *without* Sin, may leave all they Command in theſe, or the like matters, quite undone at his pleaſure? Here you ſee ſix things, all mainly neceſſary to be known by the Church, as a Community; none of the which are plainly told Her in Scripture. Theſe ſix points, added to the former three, make nine. Let us then proceed. 7. Tenth-

7. Tenthly, this Community or Church muſt alſo be plainly told, what publick Service Her Paſtors may, and ought to perform in the Church? Whether they may have none at all, as now the faſhion is? Or whether they may have ſuch an one as is different, even in the prime ſubſtance, from all the World; as the faſhion was heretofore? For it cannot but be a thing highly importing, in a whole Community, to retain ſuch or ſuch a publick Service as was, at leaſt in ſubſtance, appointed by the Apoſtles; and not to make what changes private Men, or National Synods pleaſe; nor to diſcard all publick Service: Yea, that very Service which all Chriſtians of all Nations, (which were not confeſſed Hereticks) every where uſed; as appears by all their moſt ancient Service Books which you could find in any Corner of Chriſtendom. The begining of the ſubſtantial things in this *Liturgy*, or publick Service, can never be found out, by all diligent ſearch uſed by Proteſtants this laſt hundred Years; tho' the time of every little accidental change be extant in many records, which would not have failed to record the beginings of the ſubſtance of the *Liturgy*, had it had any begining, different from that common begining, of all practiſes of Chriſtian Religion brought in by the Apoſtles.

8. *Eleventhly;* The Church is primely concerned in the uſe Lawful or Unlawful of Sacraments, and therefore this (as all other things neceſſary for Her) ſhould be plainly taught Her in Scripture: And yet in all Scripture She can neither find the Name of Sacrament in this ſenſe which *we*, and our Adverſaries take it, nor any Rule, to direct Her to know what a Sacrament is? Or what is required to the Lawful Adminiſtration of true Sacraments? Which our Adverſaries hold to be ſo neceſſary to the true Church, that in their *Tenth Article*, they make it one of their two certain Signs and Marks, by which the true Church may always be known from the falſe Church; and yet (*O prepoſterous proceedings!*) they, *who will* have all neceſſary things ſet down plainly in Scripture; know very well that

that many neceſſary things, concerning the true uſe of Sacraments, be no where expreſſed therein, as no one of thoſe things are which I have now named, nor many other things concerning their true uſe; for example, by *whom* is every Sacrament neceſſarily to be adminiſtred? Whether muſt the Miniſters of all Sacraments of neceſſity have any Orders, or none at all? And what Order muſt they have? by whom, and in what manner, or in what Form muſt theſe Sacraments be conferred? or whether are *we* bound to uſe theſe Sacraments only when *we* liſt, and as often, or as ſeldom as *we* liſt? For nothing of this point is delivered in Scripture, nor of the other things I juſt now named, whence very many, and very important differences be amongſt us; all undecidable by Scripture, which is ſo deeply ſilent in all theſe points. Hence ſome of you, for ordering Prieſts and Deacons, require Biſhops ordained, and ordaining with ſuch a Form as never Antiquity uſed; And without theſe Prieſts, they ſay, there is no Lawful adminiſtring Sacraments, at leaſt in publick: Yea, tho' they hold Matrimony no Sacrament, yet *we* ſee a World make ſcruple about the Lawfulneſs of it, except by ordained Miniſters or at leaſt ticket Miniſters: A thing manifeſtly not expreſſed in Scripture, to which notwithſtanding they all contend nothing to be added. Others therefore far more conſequently anſwer, that what is not plainly ſet down in Scripture, is thereby ſignified not to be neceſſary; but it is not plainly ſet down in Scripture, that of neceſſity Prieſts are to be ſo ordained, or are only to Adminiſter Sacraments, or that they only ſhould have Power to Bleſs the Bread: For where is this Written? For *Chriſt*, after he had taken the Wine, ſaid: *Drink you all:* Which Words import a command to Lay-men to drink (*as you ſay;*) Why therefore do not theſe Words: *Do you this*, concern all Lay-People as well as your Prieſts, who can ſhew no better Authority *why they only* ſhould Bleſs the Bread and Wine? You differ alſo, whether the Bread of neceſſity muſt be of Wheat, or Barley? Oats, or Peaſe? In Baptiſm, ſome will have ſuch, and ſuch Words to be neceſſary;

others

others will allow Baptiſm in the Name of *Chriſt* alone; others will ſay no Words at all are neceſſary. For *(ſay they)* when our Saviour would have his Apoſtles *to ask in his Name*, *John* 16. 23. 24. he is not to be underſtood, that of neceſſity they ſhould uſe any Words, ſo when he did bid them, *Go and teach all Nations, Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, &c. Matt.* 28. He is not neceſſarily and plainly to be ſo underſtood, as if he did bid them to uſe any Words at all, for this is not ſet down in Scripture, and what is not plainly ſet down in Scripture is thereby held by you unneceſſary. Lo, here in this number, how many other things have been ſet *down* by me all, ſo neceſſary to the Church, *as a Community*; and yet not plainly told Her by the Scripture? But let all theſe many things go to make up an even dozen. This dozen proves twelve times over what I ſaid of the Church taken as a Community.

9. But moſt of theſe things alſo are neceſſary to be known by ſome peculiar States of Perſons, which muſt of neceſſity be in this Community. For in it their muſt be Lawful Paſtors, who cannot know themſelves to be Lawful Paſtors, nor carry themſelves for ſuch, unleſs they know themſelves to be ſent by Lawful Authority; becauſe (according to your Doctrine,) the other (and the only other) mark of the true Church, is ſet down *in your tenth Article* to be the true preaching of the word of God. *But how ſhall they preach, unleſs they be* (Lawfully) *ſent*? Rom. 10. 15. They muſt know alſo whether, according to God's ordinance, any other be their Superiours to Judge them, correct them, &c. That ſo they may diſcharge their duty in obeying them. They muſt know the bounds and Limits of their Power over ſome, or all Lay-Men. They muſt know what their duty is to ſee the Decrees of national or general Councels obſerved, when the Councels are Lawful; and conſequently they muſt be furniſhed with ſufficient means to know the lawfulneſs of them: Which they can never be, but by knowing thoſe ſix things ſpecified above N. 6. no one of which ſix things are clearly told them by any Scrip-

Scripture. To these Pastors also it belongeth to perform the publick service in due manner, and to teach the People when they are bound to assist at it; and consequently they, of necessity must be told which is the publick Service used by the Apostles, and their Successors instructed by them to use it. For who can believe they used none at all, tho' what they used be no otherwise written then in the Publick practise of, not one, but as many Nations as they converted; all which used Lyturgies containing the essence and substance of a true Sacrifice. These Pastors also must know all that in the last number we said to belong to the whole necessary knowledge of true Sacraments: They must know, for example, whether they may permit Women to Baptize in case of necessity. As I shall shew all antiquity to have held and practised, though there be no such thing clearly set down in Scripture; and so for other things. And Thus much for Clergy-men, and their State. Mariage is also a state of millions of Lay-men, and to which so many of them, not yet Married, do pretend: Now some things under pain of Damnation must be practised and consequently known, by these men; which notwithstanding are not plainly told them in Scripture: As whether they may have two Wives, or no, at on time? we all hold this Damnable, and yet this obligation of having but one (so hard to many) is no where clearly, and manifestly set down in any Scripture: Secondly, it is Damnable to them to Marry within such and such Degrees of Kindred, as we all hold, where be these Degrees cleerly told us in the new Scripture. If we are to practise what is in the Old Testament, men may, at once, have one or more Wives; against which you have no clear Text in all the New Testament. I might add that it is necessary to those who marry, to know whither it be Lawful to do so without a Priest, there being no such thing intimated in Scripture according to which Holy and Misterious things are known to have been Lawfully performed by the Ministery of Lay-men. For the killing of the Paschal-Lamb

was

was both holy and misterious, and yet done by Lay-men. Why may not then Marriage be performed without a Priest? Add now these two or three things to the former dozen, and you have at least fourteen several things, the knowledge of which are all necessary to men of several States in the Church; and yet no where set down in plain Scripture. I say here nothing of the Obligation which Parents have, to send their Children to be Baptized in due time, because of the Obligation of Baptizing Children we shall speak hereafter *Sect.* 8. *n.* 3. as also of sending them to such who can Lawfully administer Baptism; of which I have said some thing.

10. Lastly speaking of all in general, whatsoever they be, many of the things now specified must, under pain of Damnation be known by them, that they may practice their necessary duty which obligeth all and every one to be of a Church which hath lawful Pastors; and which hath lawful Priests, Ordained, with the matter and Form which is necessary, by true Bishops, and not false ones; and the Preachers of which Church must have true Mission, all must know also, how far they are bound to obey these their Lawful Pastors, both with interior submission of Judgement in some cases, and also exterior conformity, in others. They all must know themselves to be of a Church where God is publickly served; with that publick service which the Apostles brought into the Church, and commended to their Successors. Every on is bound not to work upon the Sundayes, as we will shew, though neither this, nor yet many other things (of which we shall speak in many of the next sections) be plainly set down in any Scripture. Here we have had above 14. of these things specified, only for the full declaration of these words; *necessary to Salvation:* all which you say are plainly set down in Scripture.

11. Let us now declare these Words, *plainly set down in Scripture;* that all may plainly see how many more great new difficulties spring from them. *The first difficulty* (cleared by no plain Scripture) is, whether the Book of Scripture, in which

ſuch a point is ſet down, be Gods Word, or no; as when it is written in the Book of *Toby*, *Judith*, the *Machabees*, the *Apocalyps? The ſecond difficulty*, cleared alſo by no plain Scripture, is whether, tho' ſuch a Book be Gods Word; yet I be ſecured, that it hath not been corrupted in the Chapter or verſe, expreſſing the point in Controverſie. *The third difficulty*, cleared plainly by no Scripture is, that theſe Words, on which the Controverſie depends, be infallibly taken in this place in their common and uſual ſenſe, or perhaps taken figuratively, or ſpoken miſtically of ſome other thing. For how is it poſſible, by Scripture only, to come to have an infallible knowledge of this, on which the Controverſie wholly depends? Being this depends meerly on the inward free will of God, who perhaps would uſe only the plain vulgar ſenſe of theſe Words in this place, perhaps would uſe them only Figuratively, or only Myſtically. To know this ſecret free will of God, and that infallibly, I muſt have ſuch a Revelation, or ſuch an aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, as you will not allow to the Church repreſented in a Council, and therefore it cannot prudently be allowable to any private Man: Neither can any private Man ſhew plain Scripture for his particular pretence, to know infallibly this ſecret Will of God. *A fourth difficulty* (not to be cleared by plain Scripture) is, that after I have peruſed the whole Scripture, purpoſely to know what I am bound of neceſſity to believe, and do, for my Salvation; I find no where plainly told me, that I am only to believe, and do that only which is plainly told me in Scripture: So that perhaps I may be bound both to believe, and do, ſomewhat not expreſſed clearly in Scripture, eſpecially it not being clear, plain, and manifeſt by Scripture, that I am not to hear the Church, not admit of unwritten Traditions, but ſtand only to what is written. But of theſe *four* difficulties we ſhall ſpeak fully in the following Sections.

12. Now we muſt conſider how theſe Words, *Plainly ſet down in Scripture*; be yet liable to *a fifth difficulty*; which is, that Men of quite contrary Perſwaſions in Faith, ſay, that ſuch

ſuch a Text ſayes plainly this; an other ſays, that it ſays plainly no ſuch thing; yea, that it ſayes the plain contrary: Witneſs thoſe Words, *This is my Body;* which, as you bring it about, muſt plainly ſignifie, *This is not my Body.* And, thus we contend whether Scripture be plain and clear? Which makes it plain and clear, that Scripture, tho' ſubmitted to by us both, ends neither of our differences in moſt important matters.

13. *A ſixth difficulty* (and a moſt fruitful Mother of a number of difficulties) ariſes from your own Explications, and Declarations, and Modifications, and Limitations, and as good as Annihilations, by which you ſo reſtrain this Principle; which you ſtrain ſo much at other times, to make it reach home to all points neceſſary, by a clear decifion of them all, even in any neceſſary Controverſie. Doctor *Ferne*, with whoſe Words I began this Section, tells us, that all things neceſſary are not ſo plainly ſet down, that every one who reads Scripture, can manifeſtly draw out of it the knowledge of all points that are neceſſary; but (ſayes he) *it is enough, if it be done by the Miniſters.* So little plain dealing there is in calling, or miſcallieg that thing *plain;* which plainly proves it ſelf not to be ſo, by not being *plain* to any, who are not as knowing Men as their Miniſters. All Women (who ſo deſperatly read, and cite the Bible) may now deſpair of knowing, by their own reading, even thoſe very things which are neceſſary to Salvation. This, they now tell you, muſt be done for you by Miniſters, from whom if you will have it, you muſt take it on their Word: For you are a Reprobate if you tell them their plain Deductions are not plain, nor conformable to Scripture; tho' you may be one of the Elect, and yet ſay ſo much againſt what whole General Councels have deduced from Scripture. But this which they would have you believe to be plainly ſet down, they tell you cannot be found out to be ſo by all kind of Miniſters, *but only by ſuch* (point them out with your Finger if you can) as uſe all theſe things following. 1. *Attention.* 2. *Diligence in ſearch*

of the Scripture. 3. *Collation of places.* 4. *Obſerving the connexions.* 5. *Sincerity and Impartiality.* 6. *Prayer and Devotion for aſſiſtance in the Work.* To all which you muſt ever put this *Notandum*, that neither you can tell, when they have uſed theſe things ſufficiently, to come to the plain and wholly neceſſary Truth; nor they can tell whether there has not creapt in ſome Error in the uſe of theſe means, ſpoiling all. Neither will the uſe of theſe only ſuffice: Skill in Greek, and deep skill, is required for peruſing the New Teſtament, and no leſs skill in *Hebrew* for the Old. To theſe, ſtill fallible Rules, ſo many more are to be added out of your own Divines, that your Great Divine *Sanchius* (*de Sacra Scriptura Col.* 409.) aſſigns no fewer then *Nineteen Rules*, beſides the having *the Spirit of God* (quite forgot by D. *Ferne*) and beſides *underſtanding the Words and places of Scripture.* No wonder then that *your* learned *Scharpius* (*in curſu Theologico de Scriptoribus, Controverſ.* 8 *p.* 44.) aſſigns *full twenty Rules* for the underſtanding of Scripture; *which, unleſs they be kept, we cannot but Err*, as he ſayes. I *wonder how many* more Rules be neceſſary for ordinary underſtanding Men, to know that you have not Erred in the uſe of all theſe *twenty* Rules, eſpecially he and others exacting among other Rules, to know *Original Languages, to diſcuſs the Words and Hebraiſms.* Now, dear Reader, as thou loveſt thy Soul, ſtand here a little, and ponder how thy Miniſters abuſe thee, which do, all of them, teach this Doctrine (delivered by D. *Ferne in Sect.* 8. 9 10. 11. and 14. in theſe Words, the place laſt cited:) *If you will be with us, you ſhall ſee what you do. We require your obedience to what we demonſtrate to be Gods Will. The Church of Rome* (becauſe, forſooth, She will have you uſe the better Light of Councels illuminated by the *Holy Ghoſt*,) *ſayes; If you will come to me, you muſt put out your Eyes.* So he, ſo all the reſt do plainly cheat thee, when they tell thee, *thou ſhalt with thy own Eyes ſee all things plainly ſet down out of Scripture:* For now, when they come to their Tryal, they tell thee thou muſt

muſt truſt Miniſters, and not all, but ſuch as can, and really do uſe 20. hard Rules. But of this more *Sect.* 7. *n.* 3. Here, I only beſeech thee to tell me, how thou canſt come to think that he, *who* for our Salvation gave his Precious Blood, would not give us alſo ſome more plain Rule to direct us to the infallible belief of that, which he obliges us to believe under pain of Damnation. See *my Preface num.* 2. 3. Dear Lord! Is this that was promiſed for an extraordinary Favour (*not yet granted*) *when God himſelf ſhould come, and ſave us, and give us a Way*, ſo ſurpaſſing all former Wayes. *A Way ſo direct unto us, that Fools cannot Err by it:* For ſurely Wiſe, and very Wiſe Men know neither *Greek*, nor *Hebrew*, nor the means how to know that thoſe, *who* know theſe Languages, have duly uſed their knowledge, and the other odd Nine-teen Rules, *which unleſs they be kept, we cannot but Err.* See alſo *Sect.* 7. Here *Proteſtants with weeping Eyes may ſay*, what *Juvenal* did Sing, *O quis cuſtodiet ipſos Cuſtodes!*

What Rules to Men ſhort-ſighted given ſhall be,
To know when Overſeers overſee?

SEC-

SECTION III.

A SEVENTH ARGUMENT.

By Scripture we know not which Books be Canonical Scripture, which not?

Neither is Scripture known to be Gods Word by its own Light; wherefore Proteſtants *do not believe Scripture with Divine Faith.*

1. THe force of this Argument briefly is this. If Scripture were our only Rule of beleif, it would tell us all things neceſſarly to be believed: It doth not tell us what books be the only true word of God; which is a point moſt neceſſary to be believed: It is not therefore our only Rule of belief: Here you ſee a *fifthteenth* neceſſary, and moſt neceſſary point, not plainly ſet down in Scripture. *Luther* denyeth the *Apocalyps*, *the Epiſtle to the Hebrews*, *the Epiſtle to* St. *James*, and other parts of Scripture, what text tells him plainly he muſt believe the contrary? We hold ſome half a ſcore Books to be true Scripture, which you hold *Apocrypha:* what Scripture, or one ſingle ſyllable of Scripture, tells us we hold falſe, and you true; Cite that text, and we yield. If you cannot cite that Text, then yield your ſelves to believe many, and ſo, very many, parts of Scripture to be Gods Word, which by no one ſingle Text of Scripture, you can proye to be ſo. Tell me then, I pray tell me, as you tender your own and my Salvation, upon what ground you believe them to be ſo? You believe all things for the ſaying of true Scripture: Why do you believe the Scripture to be Scripture and Gods word? Not upon any text, for you have not one:

And

And yet you believe this infallibly. What other ground have you, beſides Texts of Scripture, able to ſupport an infallible belief? Is the Tradition of the Church to be relyed upon in ſo great a matter? Then much more may it be relyed upon in leſſer matters. But if ſhe be fallible in the delivery of her Traditions, how can I, upon Her Authority, ground an infallible aſſent to the belief of all the Books of Scripture being Gods certain word? For this is a very hard point, becauſe many of them contain things of themſelves very incredible, as that, the Perſonality of God the Father ſhould be all one thing with the Divine Eſſence; and that the Perſonality of God the Son ſhould not be all one thing with the Perſonality of God the Father; and yet be all one thing with the Divine Eſſence, which Divine Eſſence is all one thing with the Perſonality of God the Father. That the Serpent ſhould ſpeak to *Eve*: that all the World ſhould be excluded Heaven for one Mans eating an Apple. Is not that Authority, which is able to ſupport the infalllible belief of Books, which contain things ſo hard to believe, able alſo to ſupport the infallible belief of things far leſs incredible, as Purgatory, Prayer to Saints, an inferior worſhip of Images in Reſpect of the Perſons they repreſent? Have you any Text to tell me that I muſt believe the Church int his moſt hard and important matter, (to wit in this matter that ſuch and ſuch Books be infallibly Gods Word) and that I muſt not believe her in leſſer matters? Give me this Text, or confeſs that you voluntarily believe a moſt huge hard point on which all your belief in all other points muſt rely, without any ſingle Text of Scripture.

2. *D. Ferne*, to prevent this Argument, puts yet a new Limitation to the common aſſertion of *Proteſtants*; that all things neceſſary are plainly ſet down in Scripture. For ſaith he *Sect.* 13. *We ſay the Scripture contains all the material objects of Faith neceſſary to Salvation*, that is, *All things that had been neceſſary for Chriſtians to believe and do, tho' there had been no Scripture.* Whence *Sect.* 24. he out of this Principle, anſwers my Objection thus; *That to believe Scripture to be the*

Word

Word of God, is not of thoſe material Objects of Faith which we ſay are contained in Scripture, and are ſuch as had been neceſſary for Chriſtians *to believe, tho' there had been no Scripture.* And then he proves the impoſſibility, that there is, that Scripture ſhould ſufficiently tell us which Books be infallible Gods Word: And that, therefore we muſt ſuppoſe Univerſal Tradition ſtill to bring it down to us. But Sir you mark not how pittifully you undo that very prime Doctrine of yours, which forceth you all to maintain, that all things neceſſary are plainly ſet down in Scripture, to wit; That (according to you) Scripture is given us by God, to be our only direction, in all that we muſt neceſſarily believe and do for Salvation: for if this Doctrine muſt paſs among all for ſo very true, that it muſt be imbraced by the belief of all, before they can wiſely ſay; *In this Bible only we are to find all neceſſary truth;* It follows then moſt undoubtedly upon Gods giving us the Bible, to be taken by us as our only Rule, that there muſt needs ariſe a neceſſity of our believing ſomething which we ſhould not have been bound to believe, if there had been no Scripture written. For there muſt ariſe a neceſſity of believing this very Doctrine of yours, that the written Word of God is given us for our only direction in the points aforeſaid, or elſe no Man is bound to believe this, and to admit of Scripture only for his Rule. For nothing can be more ſure, then that this Doctrine has not Univerſal Tradition, ſtill to bring it down to us: Therefore either this Doctrine is moſt falſe, *(as really it is:)* Or moſt falſe it is that we upon the writing of Scripture, are only obliged to believe that, to the belief of which we ſhould only have been obliged, tho' there had been no Scripture. For what ſay you to this Argument. True Faith is neceſſary to Salvation, therefore the only Rule guiding us to true Faith, muſt of neceſſity be known aſſuredly by us: Becauſe, without the guidance of this Rule we have no aſſured means *(as you ſay,)* to true Faith: But the only true Books of Scripture, are the only Rule guiding us to true Faith; as you all teach: Therefore we muſt

muſt have an infallible aſſurance of theſe true Books. Again, the more impoſſible it is for Scripture to inform us ſufficient, which Books be Scripture, which not, and that infallibly; the more certain it is, that juſt as this moſt important point of all points, and the hardeſt of them all (for it contains all the points that are moſt hard in our Faith) can be made infallibly aſſecured unto us without Scripture, ſo other points alſo may be; as Purgatory, Prayer to Saints, &c. And therefore theſe other leſs hard points may be, as infallibly, by the Tradition of the ſame Church, aſſecured unto us. For if Tradition can ſupport an infallible aſcent to the hardeſt points, it can ſupport the like aſcent to the leſs hard. He that can carry a hundred pound Weight, can carry three or four ſcore pound Weight.

3. Hence it is that D. *Ferne*, in the ſame place, is forced to fly to that paradoxical Opinion, to which nothing, but deſperation of eſcaping any other way, has driven him and his Proteſtant Bretheren. Thus then he ſays; *Scripture being received upon ſuch Tradition, it diſcovers it ſelf to be Divine by its own Light, or thoſe internal Arguments which appear in it to thoſe who are verſed in it.* Which others expreſs thus; the Canonical Books are worthy to be believed for themſelves; as we aſcent to the firſt Principles by their own Light, ſo we do aſcent to Scripture to be the Word of God, through the help of the Spirit of God, as by its own Light. The Canonical Books bear witneſs of themſelves; they carry their own Light, by which we may ſee them to be Gods Word: As we ſee the Sun, to be the Sun, by his own Light; ſo they.

4. We muſt then firſt ſpeak a Word of this Tradition, which D. *Ferne* called *Univerſal Tradition*, that is, the Tradition of the whole Church, which you all ſay is fallible, and ſo you muſt not reſt upon it with an infallible aſcent, but take it as a prudent motive perſwading ſuch Books, as you hold to be Canonical, to be Gods Word, which you believe to be ſo for it ſelf. But *Sir* it is moſt falſe that *Univerſal Tradition* has delivered juſt that number of Books, and thoſe Books, which

you hold to belong to the true Canon. The Council of *Laodicea* (in which you use to boast your Canon to be contained) omitteth the Apocalyps or Revelations, and besides *Rufinus*, you will not find one Ancient Writer who either puts no fewer or more Books in the Canon then you do. Our Canon you deny, and discard some half a score Books out of it. Yet ours is the only Canon which can claim a sufficient Tradition, as I shall here shew; Num. 11. And as for the Council of *Laodicea*, it is far from being against us, for it defines indeed such Books to belong to the Canon of Scripture: But it does not exclude any one of those which also afterward, when due examen was made, were found delivered, if not with as full, yet with a Tradition sufficiently full; as you may see in the third Council of *Carthage*, to which St. *Austin* subscribed in Person. An evident Proof of this is, that the *sixth* General Council does confirm both this Council of *Laodicea*, and that very Council of *Carthage*, which by name defined all the Books, set down in our Canon, to be Gods Word: See Num. 11. And then tell me with what Face you can so much as pretend to *Universal Tradition*, for admitting your Bible a Bible putting among the Apocrypha so many Books, flatly against the Tradition of the precedent 12. hundred Years. If this Tradition be a prudent inducement to imbrace what it commends, then it induces us to imbrace half a score Books more then you put in your Canon: If it be not a prudent inducement, it helps you nothing. If you fly to the Tradition of the Church only of the first four hundred Years, remember that the Council of *Carthage*, just after the end of those Years, alledged the *Ancient Tradition of their Fathers*, which they Judged sufficient for defining our Canon. They, who were so near those first four hundred Years, knew far better the more Universal Tradition of that Age, then we can 12. hundred Years after it. True it is (nothing being defined as then) private Doctors were free to follow what they Judged to be truest: And as you find them varying from our Canon, some in some Books, some in others; so you will find

find them varying from one an other, and varying alſo from you. For in thoſe firſt four hundred Years *Melito* and *Nazianzen* excluded the Book of *Eſter*, which you add. *Origen* doubts of the *Epiſtle to the Hebrews*, of the ſecond of St. *Peter*, of the firſt and ſecond of St. *John*. St. *Cyprian* and *Nazianzen* leave the Apocalyps or Revelations out of their Canon. *Euſebius* doubted of it. Only *Rufinus* agrees juſt with you. *Does he make alone a ſufficiently Univerſal Tradition from* Chriſt's *time to this?* Now then all of you, by refuſing the Canon commended by the Tradition of our Church; are leſt to the Sagacity of your own Noſes, to Hunt out that moſt important and infallible certain truth of the true Canon of Scripture.

5. Here we muſt examine what help you will have by the true Books of Scripture, which *you ſay carry* their own light with them; by which *they may* be as clearly ſeen to be Gods Word, as the Sun by his own Light. For to the truth of this ſtrange Paradox, explicated as above, you have brought the whole ſubſtance of your Faith, which muſt all fall to the ground, to be trodden upon by the *Socinians*, if this groundleſs ground holds not ſure: Becauſe you believe all other particular points relying upon Scripture only; All the Scripture you believe relying on this ground only, that you know by the very reading of ſuch a Book, that this Book is as evidently Gods Word, by a certain Light which the reading of it *(with Spirit)* produceth, as you ſee the Sun by his Light. Indeed you have brought your Religion to as pittiful a caſe as your greateſt Enemies could wiſh it in.

6. Firſt, then this ground (upon which you ground all) is accounted a plain Fooliſh ground, by your own renowned *Chillingworth*; I ſay, your own, for the moſt Learned of both your Univerſities have owned, and highly magnified his Book, notwithſtanding his ſcornful Language concerning this ground of your whole Religion. *Chillingworth* then *(p. 69. n. 49.)* anſwering theſe Words of his Adverſary. *That the Divinity of*

a Writing cannot be known by it ſelf alone, but ſome intrinſecal Authority: Replyes thus: *This you need not prove: For no wiſe Man denyes it.* And Mr. *Hooker* (eſteemed the learnedeſt Proteſtant which ever put Pen to Paper) *writeth* thus; *Of things neceſſary, the very chiefeſt is to know what Books we are to eſteem Holy, which point is confeſſed impoſſible for the Scripture it ſelf to teach.* So he Eccl. Pol. L. 1. S. 14. Pag. 86. And D. *Covel* in his Defence, Art. 4. P. 31. *It is not the Word of God which does or can aſſure us, that we do well to think it the Word of God.* Yet that which ſuch Men as theſe hold impoſſible, and a meer *Chymæra*, or Fanſie, which *no Wiſe Man would hold*, you hold to be as evident as the Sun being ſeen by its own Light; as evident as the firſt Principles, which are ſo evident of themſelves that they need no Proof, but are clearer then any thing you can bring to prove them. For Example, *That the whole is greater then any part. It is impoſſible that any thing ſhould be ſo, and not be ſo, juſt in the ſame circumſtances, &c.* Do you think any rational Man will believe that it is thus evident that St. *Matthæus* Goſpel (for example) is the true Word of God, by the only reading of it, to him, who did not before read this verity? Do not all evidently ſee, that there is no ſuch evidence to be ſeen? About the truth of firſt Principles no Man ever doubted, or could doubt; about St. *Matthews* Goſpel the *Manicheans*, *Marcioniſts*, *Cerdoniſts*, &c. did not only doubt, but flatly rejected it. And incomparable more doubt hath been made of other parts of Scripture, as we have ſeen, and ſhall yet further ſee. Sometimes indeed Divines call Scripture *the firſt Principle*, *an undoubted Principle*, *a moſt known and certain Principle*, Not that it is ſo for any evidence it carryes with it ſelf, manifeſtly ſhewing it to be ſo: But the Scripture is ſaid to be ſuch a Principle among us Chriſtians, becauſe all of us now admit Scripture, as of unqueſtionable and infallible truth upon this *Suppoſition* (evidently granted by us all) we all, in arguing with one another, ſtill *ſuppoſe*, and take for an undoubted

doubted Principle, that the Scripture is Gods infallible Word. But this does *only ſuppoſe*, and not prove this truth, even ſo much as to our own Conſciences, that Scripture is the undoubted Word of God, which it cannot ſhew it ſelf infallibly to be, by the only reading of it.

7. Secondly, There are many millions who can moſt truly and ſincerely proteſt before God, and take it upon their Salvation, that they are wholly unable, by the meer reading of the Books of Scripture (for example the *Apocalyps*, the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, &c.) to come to an infallible aſſurance that they are Gods Word, to which aſſurance, even your admirable *Luther*, and his moſt learned Diſciples, never came: For they all reject theſe, and other Books admitted for Gods infallible Word by you. Now good SIR, tell me what means hath God provided to bring us (*who have not theſe new Eyes, requiſite to ſee the Sun-ſhine you ſpeak of*) or to bring your *Lutheran* Brethren who will be confeſſed not to want the true Spirit, (*for they had the firſt Fruits of the Spirit in the Bleſſed work of your Reformation*) what means, I ſay has God provided to bring them and us, to this infallible aſſurance, by which we are all obliged, under pain of Damnation, to believe the Scripture to be Gods Word?

8. Thirdly; how comes it to paſs, that the Preachers of the Church find that concurrance of Gods Grace, in delivering the verities contained in the Scripture to very Heathens, that millions of them have been thus converted: But no ſingle Man is reported (as far as I know) to have found ſuch concurrance by only reading the writen Word, as thereby to have been illuminated with the belief of Scripture? How comes this about, if the Divinity thereof be to the Reader (when he is as well diſpoſed as the Hearer,) no leſs evident then the broad Sun ſhine? Doth not this ſhew that it is true which we teach, that theſe internal Arguments are only diſcovered after the Scripture is accepted for Gods Word, and not before, as the Cauſe of accepting it for ſuch?

9. Fourth-

9. Fourthly; as the Scripture is the only ground, upon which you build your belief of all other things; so this Divine Light (discovered to you by reading: the Scripture) is the only ground, upon which you believe Scripture; and consequently all other things which you believe. This ground then is the ground of all true Faith, according to your Doctrine. If it be so; how is it possible that the greateſt Doctors that ever God placed in the Church to the edifying the same, upon no one single occasion (having so continual occasions) do so much, as once at least profess themselves to believe such or such a Book to be Gods Word, because they, by the reading of it (which was their daily and nightly Work) did discover such Divine Rayes, or such internal Arguments appearing in it, to those who were versed in it; as *D. Ferne* speaks? Neiher do any one of them give so much as once, this for a reason why they doubted of, or admitted not such, and such Books, about which (before the definition of the Church) there were so frequent Controversies, meerly because they could not discover this light, or these internal Arguments. Did these Men want the Spirit of God, even in the Foundation of all true belief? Yea, had not these men of all others the most observing Eyes, & most irradiated understandings which so many Ages have brought forth? This Argument falls heavier upon D. *Ferne*, and those who like his Doctrine, then upon any other. For *Sect.* 7. having undertaken to shew, *that Sectaries cannot make the plea which Protestants make*; he proves this by this Principle: That Sectaries do not pretend to confirm what they say by *practice of antiquity as Protestants do*, according to *D. Ferne* and *Doct. Hen. Hammond*. But O great Doctor! I pray, if you can, shew us but one small scrap of Antiquity for this your Fundamental Doctrine: For surely this most imports in the very groundwork of Faith. And (to use your so often iterated Argument) your part being the affirmative; affirming a main difference to be between you and Sectaries (arising from your adhearing close to antiquity) you are obliged to

to do this, at leaſt where it ſo imports, as it doth in the belief of that upon which you believe all whatſoever you believe. Again, if you be ſo good at finding out aſſuredly Gods true Word, from his falſe Word, meerly by this your ſharp Eye ſight, you might do notable ſervice to thoſe who now at *London* ſet forth the moſt famous Bible that ever as yet (*as they ſay*) did ſee light. For you could tell them aſſuredly which were the true Copies of the true Originals, which not; whereas thoſe ſhort ſighted Doctors do openly profeſs themſelves to to ſweat at this, by indefatigable labour in conferring every verſe with ſeveral Copies, and then culling out that which agrees with the moſt and beſt Copies. To this induſtry they profeſs themſelves to truſt, and not to that pretended Light; tho' you make it the ground of all your Faith. See the next *Sect.* n. 8.

10. Fiftly; I argue thus, Take the Book of *Baruch*, (which you hold not to be Gods Word) in the one hand, and the Book of *Micheas* in the other hand; this Book hath ſeven Chapters: Now I challenge you, if you can, to tell me that Chapter, or the part of that Chapter in any one of theſe ſeven Chapters, which hath more Divine Rayes, or internal Arguments for the Holineſs of it, then appear in the ſix Chapters of the Book of *Baruch*. Your part is the affirmative, affirming that there be ſuch internal Arguments and ſuch Evidences, and that there are more of them in the one, then in the other: Shew me but one of them; or elſe you will ſhew your ſelves to the World to vent your own Fanſies, for grounds of belief, even in the moſt important points of belief. So I ſay again, take the Book of *Toby*, take the Book of *Judith*, which you reject for *Apocryphal*, as not carrying with them a Divine Light, and thoſe internal Arguments: Take (*I ſay*,) either of theſe Books, and read it over, and be as well verſed in it as you are in the Book of *Numbers*, for example; and ſee if it be poſſible for you, with all the help your Brethren can afford you, to point out any one Chapter, Verſe, or Word in the

the Book of *Numbers*, carrying with it more Divine Rayes, or better internal Arguments, then appear in either of the Books I named. What would you have us do with our Eyes, to keep us from ſeeing how clearly this is impoſſible unto you; which nevertheleſs ſhould be moſt eaſie, if your Opinion were true, or any thing like to true. For theſe Divine Rayes (*ſay you*) carry an evidence of ſo high a Degree, that you do not only believe (*as we Poor Folks do*) but you do know theſe Books to be Divine: And this you know with a moſt infallible knowledge, produced by the evidence carried in the clear Sun-ſhine of this Light, and theſe ſo conſpicious internal Arguments making it no leſs apparent then the firſt Principles.

11. Sixthly if any one verſe, or any one ſmall word, changing the ſence of the Holy Ghoſt (eſpecially this little word, *Not*) beleft out in any one Chapter, either through ignorance, malice or careleſneſs of thoſe Writers (whoſe Copies our printed Bibles have followed;) whom will you be able to make believe, that you are ſo ſharp-ſighted as to ſee this ſmall omiſſion, and that by a light ſufficing for an infallible belief of it appearing to you only by the reading that place. And yet this you muſt do to diſtinguiſh the true Word of God from the falſe. But how far all of you are from doing this, I will now declare: All the dayes of Queen *Elizabeth* your Bibles did read in the 105. Pſalms. v. 28. *they were not obedient*, contrary directly to the true Text; which hath, *They were not diſobedient, or rebelled not againſt his words*, as now you read it. Theſe, and two hundred more Corruptions in the true Pſalms, you did ſing daily. And who was there who did ſee in what places theſe corruptions were? Yea the Queen, then Head of the Church, made her Clergy ſubſcribe that all theſe corruptions were Gods own Word. See the 5. *Sect. num.* 4. whence appears that you cannot ſmell out theſe Corruptions; of which I ſhall ſay more in the place cited. They then of your Religion believe the Scripture upon no ground which is not fallible, and which may not really be falſe as this

Light

Light may be; and therefore it ſuffices not to a Divine Faith: And ſo you have no infallible belief aſſuring you, that this Book is Gods word; whence all that is in that Book hath no Divine Authority, of which you are aſſured. And thus, moſt pittifully, all of you are deſtitute of a Divine Faith, in all points you believe; becauſe you believe them all upon the Authority of thoſe Books, which you upon no infallible ground, can believe to be Divine. See here how you, who boaſt of Scripture ſo much, come, by rejecting the Church, not to believe the Scripture it ſelf with any Divine Faith; but only with ſuch Humane perſwaſion as may be falſe, becauſe it is fallible, having no infallible ground to ſtand upon. Hence it is that your Famous *Chillingworth*, having wit enough to diſcover the ungroundedneſs of this ground, and not having Grace enough to ſet ſure footing upon that firm Rock of the true Church, in plain terms comes to defend (*p.* 127.) it to be ſufficient to believe Scripture with no other kind of aſcent, then we believe, *That there is ſuch a City as* Conſtantinople, *or the Hiſtory of* Cæſar *and* Saluſt. Whence the ground of his belief of the Scripture (upon whoſe Authority only he believeth all other things) being thus confeſſedly found to be Humane, and to have nothing of Divine Faith: He is forced to ſay (*p.* 159.) *We have, I believe, as great reaſon to believe, That there was ſuch a Man as* Henry the Eight *King of* England, *as that* Jeſus Chriſt *ſuffered under* Pontius Pilate. Is this a Book to be owned by the prime Doctors of both Univerſities, and to be ſo Univerſally cryed up by our Nation? *Dear Jeſu!* to what times were we come? No wonder that theſe times are now come to us.

12. Seventhly; I further ſhew the manifeſt falſity of your Doctrine, by unanſwerable experience, confirming what now I ſaid *Nu.* 9. *Luther* (a Man acknowledged by common conſent of *Engliſh* Divines, to have had Gods Spirit in a very large meaſure,) did read the Epiſtle of St. *James*, and he held it to be an Epiſtle of Straw, *Præfat. in Nov. Teſt.* and his chief

Diſciple *Pomeranus*, upon the fourth Chapter to the *Romans*, ſayes: *Out of this place you may diſcover the Error of the Epiſtle of* James, *in which you ſee a wicked Argument: Moreover he ridiculouſly deduces his Argument: He cites* (ſayes this Fellow) *Scripture againſt Scripture.* But I go on with *Luther*, he did read the *Apocalyps*, and for all the light and internal Arguments he could diſcover in it, he thought *it not written with an Apoſtolical Spirit.* All our *Engliſh* Divines read theſe ſelf-ſame Books, and there is not one of them, nor of their Diſciples, ſo ill ſighted, but they can diſcover a light no leſs clearly ſhewing theſe Books to be Gods infallible Word, then the Sun ſhews himſelf to be the Sun by his light; they all ſee internal Arguments ſufficing to an infallible aſcent of the quite contrary Verity. But how can that ground be but falſe which grounds plain Contradictions? If you reply, that *Luthers* not ſeeing ſuch Books to be Canonical, is only a negative Argument of ſmall force. I anſwer, that, where things are affirmed to be as evident as the Sun ſhine, and as clear as the firſt Principles: And that theſe things affirmed by you to be ſo clear, are alſo daily ſet before the Eyes of a Man ſo well ſeeing, as *Luther*, and his prime Diſciples were; and yet, that neither he, nor his prime Diſciples, ſhould ever be able to ſee this light (tho' their ſharp-ſighted Eyes ſo often laboured to diſcover it:) This cannot be but a certain ſign that either theſe Men were pittifully Blind, or that you miſerably fanſie ſuch a Light to ſhine in the very reading of the *Apocalyps*, the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, the Epiſtle of St. *James*, &c. Is it a weak Argument to ſay; I have been in the Hall on ſet purpoſe to ſee if there were a Candle ſet up Lighted there, and I could ſee none, tho' I moſt carefully endeavoured to ſee it, and had my Eyes about me; therefore I conclude there is no light ſet up there? I conclude alſo that either I, who ſay this, am Blind; or you, who ſay there is ſuch a Light, are manifeſtly deluded by a falſe fanſie of your own? And I can alſo make my Argument as ſtrong in the affirmative, as in the negative. I do it thus;

thus; St. *Auſtin* (the moſt ſharp ſighted Man that the Church has had,) a Man confeſſedly indued with the true Spirit; and a Man of your own Religion, as you will ſay; and conſequently a Man agreeing with you in that Doctrine, on which all your whole belief is built; to wit, that true Scripture were infallibly believed to be Gods Word, becauſe they were diſcovered in the very reading of them to be ſo, by a Divine Light, and by internal Arguments ſufficing to ground an infallible aſſent to this Verity; this Man, *I ſay*, and the whole third Council of *Carthage* together with him, did believe that all and every one of thoſe Books, which we believe to be Canonical and Divine, to be ſo indeed; and to be propounded to be ſo to the People. Behold here, as good Eyes, as you can pretend to have, reading theſe Books, and believing them infallibly to be Divine: Which they could not do (according to *your* Doctrine) but by diſcovering in them a Divine Light, ſhewing this truth evidently, and by ſuch internal Arguments as ſuffice to infallibility. Therefore theſe Books, (*ſeen ſo infallibly to be Divine*) are indeed ſo: And you muſt grant them to be ſo, and not to be *Apocryphal*, as you hold them; or elſe you muſt grant, that St. *Auſtin* and the Fathers of the Council of *Carthage*, and all the Fathers, who ever after this Council held this our Canon, did not agree with you in the prime Principle of *your* Religion, teaching that there is no infallible ground to believe ſuch and ſuch Books to be Gods Word, but that Divine Light appearing in the reading of them to ſuch Readers as *they* were. For if *they* agreed with you in this Principle, then *they* did conceive themſelves to diſcover this Divine Light in thoſe very Books, which you call *Apocryphal*, as well as in the other, which you hold Canonical: And if they all were deceived by this Principle, in thoſe Books; then *you may* be deceived in all the other, becauſe *your only* ground for their being Divine, is hence clearly proved to be falllible and falſe, and moſt unſufficient to ground and infallible belief: But you have no other Faith, then that which reſts wholly on this ground; there-

fore all the Faith you have is fallible. And if any one Object that St. *Ferome*, (as great a Doctor in point of the knowledge of the Scriptures as St. *Auſtin*) did not hold the Books of the *Machabees* for Gods Word, which St. *Auſtin* held to be Gods Word; Therefore one of them relied on a fallible ground; why not St. *Auſtin* as well as St. *Ferome*? I anſwer, that even from hence it is evident that neither of theſe two (tho the moſt Eagle-ſighted Doctors that ever the Church had) did make the ground of their receiving or rejecting Books for true or falſe Scripture, to be any ſuch Divine Light, appearing to ſuch Readers as both they were: For then they could not have held quite contrary one to another; as I ſaid of the *Lutherans* and *you*. The true Reaſon, why theſe two great Doctors were of contrary Opinions concerning theſe Books, as alſo divers other Holy Fathers were concerning divers other Books, (which had been impoſſible if the evidence of true Scripture had been ſo great as you make it;) the true Reaſon, *I ſay*, was, that as yet the Church of *Chriſt* had not defined which Books were Gods true Word, which not: Wherefore, then it was free to doubt of ſuch Books as were not admitted by ſuch a Tradition of the Church, as was evidently ſo Univerſal, that it was clearly ſufficient to ground an infallible belief. For all thoſe Holy Fathers agreed ever in this, that ſuch Books were evidently Gods Word which had evidently a ſufficient Tradition for them: Now in the days of thoſe Fathers, who thus varied from one an other, it was not by *any* infallible means made known to all, that thoſe Books (about which all their variance was) were recommended for Gods infallible Word, by a Tradition clearly ſufficient to ground belief: For the Church had not as yet examined and defined, whether Tradition did clearly enough ſhew ſuch and ſuch Books, to be Gods infallible Word. But in the days of St. *Auſtin*, the third Council of *Carthage*, Anno 397. examined how ſufficient, or unſufficient the Tradition of the Church was, which recommended thoſe Books for Scripture, about which there was ſo much doubt and contrariety of Opinions. They found

all

all the Books contained in our Canon (of which you account ſo many *Apocryphal*) to have been recommended by a Tradition, ſufficient to ground Faith upon. For on this ground (*Can.* 47.) they proceeded in defining all the Books in our Canon to be Canonical. *Becauſe*, ſay they, *we have received from our Fathers that theſe Books were to be read in the Church.* Pope *Innocent the firſt* (who lived *Anno* 402.) being requeſted by *Exuperius*, Biſhop of *Tolouze*, to declare unto him which Books were Canonical, he anſwers *Ep.* 3. that having examined what ſufficient Tradition did Demonſtrate, *Quid coſtodita ſeries temporum demonſtraret*, in the end of his Epiſtle c. 7. he ſets down, *Qui libri recipiantur in Canone Sanctarum Scripturarum. What Books are received in the Canon of the Holy Scriptures.* To wit, juſt thoſe which we now have in our Canon: And tho' he rejects many other Books, yet he rejects not one of theſe. So that after theſe Declarations of the ſufficiency of this Tradition, no one ever pertinaciouſly diſſented from it, but ſuch, as *Proteſtants* themſelves do confeſs to be *Hereticks*; until the days of *Luther*, who preſumed to call *Apocryphal*, not only thoſe Books which you count to be ſo, but alſo divers others; as I ſhewed here *nu* 1. Hence from the time of the Council of *Carthage*, and *Innocent the firſt*, all in their daily Citations of Scripture, untill the days of *Luther*, held thoſe very Books to be Gods Word which we hold to be, and were defined by them to be held to be ſo upon Tradition duly examined; And this within four hundred Years after Chriſt, yet after the time of St. *Jerome*. Now after this was done, there comes St. *Auſtin*, and ſets down all theſe Books for Canonical *Lib. de doctrina Chriſtiana c.* 8. After him comes *Gelaſius* the Pope (who lived Anno 492.) and confirms the ſame Canon. After him comes the Sixth General Council celebrated Anno 680. which in the ſecond Canon (according to the Greek Copy tranſlated by *Gentianus*) deſiring to eſtabliſh *what their Holy Fore-Fathers had delivered unto them*, confirms this, and the Council of *Carthage*. Go further downwards,

wards, and ſtill all Doctors and Writers, in their daily allegations of Scripture, cite theſe Books as Scripture. The true Canon again is ſet forth by the Councel of *Florence* An. 1438. To which Council the very *Grecians*, *Armenians*, and *Jacobites* ſubſcribed: No Man pertinaciouſly gain-ſaying this ſo well eſtabliſhed Tradition untill *Luther*. Now if the true diſcovery of Scripture be to go by the Votes of the beſt and the moſt Eyes, who ſees not, but that even by this Rule, we ſhall have above half a ſcore Books diſcovered to be Gods Word, which your own ſharp Eyes cannot ſee to be ſo? Eſpecially that ſecond Book of *Machabees* in which we ſo clearly diſcover Purgatory *c.* 12. *v* 43. 44. 45. If any Man objects, that, in the Council of *Carthage*, &c. that one Book of the Prophet *Baruch* is not ſet down by Name (tho' never excluded:) he muſt remember that this Book of *Baruch*, is joyned in our Bible with *Jeremy*, whoſe Secretary he was, and as his Secretary he joined his Book as an Appendix to *Jeremy*: And therefore it is underſtood by theſe Fathers to be admitted together with all *Jeremy*, excluding no part of him, as you exclude. I end then this Sixth Reaſon thus. The beſt ſeeing Eyes of Antiquity have ſeen different Books to be Gods Word, from thoſe which you hold to be ſo: Again, your own firſt Bretheren in your Reformation have ſeen thoſe Books not to be Canonical, which you have ſeen to be ſo; therefore the true Scripture is not infallibly to be known by ſo evident a Light as you ſpeak of, by which Contradictories can never be ſeen.

13. If any man think he can eſcape the force of any of theſe Arguments, by pretending the private aſſurance, of the Spirit, making this dimm Light appear clearly to him, which ſo many others (for want aſſiſtance of this Spirit) come not to ſee: This Man will run upon two main inconveniences. The Firſt is, that he moſt ungroundedly layes claim for himſelf, and for all the little Flock of his Bretheren, to have in private this aſſiſtance of the Spirit aſſiſting them, even as far as infallibility, to the hardeſt of all points: And yet, moſt un-

ungroundedly denyed any ſuch aſſiſtance to the Univerſal Church, repreſented in a general Councel. He denyes alſo the ſame Spirit unto the greateſt Doctors of the Church, confeſſed by all to have been the chief Lights of the World for Sanctity and knowledge in Scriptures: For all theſe are found ſtanding directly oppoſite to them in their Canon of Scripture, and not one of them can be ſhewed to agree with them in this prime ground of admitting any Book for Gods Word, upon the light which God gave him by the Spirit. The ſecond inconvenience is, that, when he is queſtioned to give an account, how he is aſſured that he in particular hath this aſſiſtance of the Spirit, ſufficing to ground an infallible aſcent; and how he is moſt aſſured that this is not an illuſion? He can only anſwer, that he hath tried, as well as he (*poor Soul*) could, whither this Spirit were from God or no; and he found it (and that infallible) to be from God. But, Sir, I ask you by what infallible means did you try it? If you ſay (as you muſt needs ſay) that you tryed it by the Word of God: We cannot but pitty your pittiful anſwer; for you forget that, before this trial was made, you could not have any aſſurance that the Scripture was Gods Word; to the belief of which truth you cannot poſſibly come, until you have firſt an infallible aſſurance, that you in particular have Gods Spirit. For tell me, by what other way you can come to this aſſurance? How can you then ſay, that you have tried your Spirit by that Word, which, before this trial of your Spirit, you could not poſſibly know to be infallibly Gods Word. You will all walk in a Circle, as the wicked do, and as that wicked Spirit who Circles about to ſee whom he can devour: Untill you come to ſtand ſtedfaſtly upon the Rock of the Church.

SEC-

SECTION IV.

A EIGTH ARGUMENT.

That the Scriptures cannot decide this Controverſie, which Books are the true uncorrupted Copies of the true Books of Scripture:

And therefore Proteſtants believe not Scripture with Divine Faith.

A Word of the Famous Bible *now coming forth at* London.

1. AS it is in vain to know for certain, that my Father did (to my great advantage) make a true authentical Will and Teſtament, of which I conceive my ſelf to have a true Copy: Without I can authentically prove the Copy that I have to be indeed authentical. So, it is to ſmall purpoſe, that God did, by his Prophets, write ſuch Books as *Geneſis*, *Exodus*, and the reſt of the Old and New Teſtament, to our ineſtimable advantage; unleſs I can alſo, by undenyable aſſurance, ſhew my ſelf to have the true authentical and uncorrupted Copies of all theſe Books; uncorrupted, I ſay, in all parts of them: For if it were not known to be uncorrupted every where, it might be ſuſpected of falſity every where. Now, that the Copies, which we have of Scripture, even in the Hebrew, or Greek Tongues, be uncorrupted, we are no where told plainly in Scripture. The laſt part of the Scripture which was written, was written about a thouſand and ſix hundred Years ago. No Scripture hath been written, ſince that time, to tell us, that ſince that time no corruption hath happened,

or

or falſifying the Copies written ſince that time: No Scripture then Written did plainly aſſure us that the Scriptures ſhould never be corrupted by thoſe who Printed, or Write them. Neither did the Apoſtles take care to have the Copies Written by them, to be authentically ſigned, ſealed, and delivered into the hands of ſuch and ſuch, as might authentically declare their being true Originals, or agreeing in all things exactly with the true Originals; which is an evident ſign, that God intended not the Scriptures for our Judge, and only direction in all points: For all Law-makers uſe this diligence, to ſecure their Laws from Corruption. Behold then, here is now a ſixteenth point primely neceſſary to Salvation, and yet no where ſet down in Scripture: I ſay, primely neceſſary; for if it be neceſſary to have Faith, it is neceſſary to have the only Rule directing and guiding to true Faith, no where made crocked and directed falſe, as a falſe corrupted Copy would do. Here then, you muſt fly to the Tradition of the Church; yea, and to the Tradition of the preſent Church alſo: For the Church of other ages could not aſſure us that the Scripture ſhould be uncorrupted in our Age. Is it not as great a contradiction as can be, to ſay, we know by the Tradition of the preſent Church that; that very Scripture is uncorrupted, which very Scripture bids us not to believe the Tradition of the Church: Which if I do not believe, I cannot believe the Scripture to be uncorrupt, and that infallibly if Her Tradition (upon which only I believe this) be fallible? The Traditions then of the preſent Church are as infallibly true as your Faith; which I prove by this Demonſtration: Your Faith cannot be more infallibly true, then it is true that the Copies of the Scripture be uncorrupt; for your Faith is built upon the Word of God, as delivered to you by theſe Copies: Juſt as we ſay, our Faith is built upon the Word of God, as propounded or delivered to us by the Church: But it is not infallibly true, that the Copies we have now are uncorrupted, becauſe that very Tradition of the preſent Church which tells us this, is held by you to be fallible and ſubject to lie; and which

in a multitude of Her other Traditions, has lied unto us, according to your Doctrine. Here you see again that you believe nothing at all with Divine Faith; For all you believe, you believe upon the Word of God, as delivered to you by such Copies as you only, by an Humane Faith, know to be the true Deliverers of Gods uncorrupted Word: This ground is fallible, being meerly Humane; therefore the ground which supports all you believe, is Humane, and not Divine; Therefore all your Faith is Humane, and not Divine: And this holds true in all and every point which you believe.

2. I will now further shew you, how you cannot know by Scripture only, that the Copies of it are uncorrupt, in those very Languages in which the Scripture was written: And yet this point is primely necessary to Salvation, as I now proved; And indeed if the Originals cannot be known assuredly to be uncorruptedly Copied out all the Translations of these Originals, may also be false: Now the more they agree with corrupted Originals, the more we are sure they are corrupted. But of Translations I will speak in the next Section: Here I will speak of the Copies, which are said to be Copied out of the true Original Copies, agreeing Word for Word with those very Copies, which St. *Paul*, St. *Matthew*, *Moses*, &c. did write; These Copies we know by no Scripture to be uncorrupt. Yea, if you will hold the Church to be fallible; I will bring you several convincing Proofs, that there can be no certainty, that these Copies agree with the true Copies written by the true Scripture Writers. These Scripture-Writers did write, either in such Hebrew as was used in the Age in which they did write, (as did the Writers of the Old Testament:) Or they did write in Greek; as did most of the Writers of the New Testament. Let us see first, how disagreeing the Hebrew Copies may be, from the Original Copy of the true Writer thereof: Then we will see the same of the Greek Copies.

3. First; diverse of the very Originals themselves were written by such Men as we know not at all, and so we cannot know them

them certainly to have been true Prophets, but by Tradition; which, if it may be falſe, it may alſo be falſe, that they were true Prophets; having Gods true Spirit, aſſuring them infallibly in all that they did Write: And ſo, tho' we did infallibly know, that we had a moſt uncorrupted Copy of what they did Write, yet we ſhould not be able to know that it were Gods infallible Word; For how could we know that he who Write this Book, was a true Prophet; no Body (as far as any Body knows) telling us one Word of that Man, good or bad? For theſe Books were written by God knows whom. We have nothing but uncertain Opinions concerning the Writers of diverſe of the moſt aſſured and protocanonical Books of Scripture: As of the Books of *Joſhua*, *Ruth*, *Judges*, *Eſther*, the Books of *Kings*, the Books of *Chronicles*, or *Paralypomenon*. So alſo, it is not certain whether *Solomon* himſelf did Write his Books of *Proverbs*: Or ſome that were about him did ſeverally, in ſcattered Papers, or note what he heard at one time; another what he heard him ſay at another time: And then, in the days of *Ezechias*, ſome certain Men (*God knows who they were*) belonging to *Ezechias*, did make that collection of them which we now have; as the moſt Learned *Lyranus* holds, Writing on that Book, and grounding himſelf on theſe Words, *cap.* 25. *Theſe are alſo Proverbs of* Solomon *which the Men of* Ezechias *Copied out*. Wherefore not upon the Authority of any Scripture; but meerly upon the Authority of Tradition, we know thoſe true Original Copies to have been Penned by true Prophets: Tho' *we* know not who they *were*.

4. But, that which I preſs moſt is, that tho' *we* had all infallible knowledge that could be, that ſuch Prophets and *Moſes* had Write, with their own Hands, ſuch and ſuch Books: Yet it is impoſſible (if the preſent Churches Authority be fallible) to know infallibly, whether the Copies we have now in our days, agree in all places exactly with the Originals. Yea, we are ſure they do not agree with it, which I prove thus: No Books of Scripture were ſo ſolemnly, publickly, and moſt au-

thentically delivered to be kept, just as they *were* Written, as the Books of *Moses*, witness the Scripture, *Exodus*, 24. *v.* 4. and *Deutr.* 31. *v.* 24. *And it came to pass when* Moses *had made an end of Writing the Words of the Law in a Book, untill they were finished: That* Moses *commanded the* Levites, *which bare the Ark of the Covenant of our Lord, saying take this Book of the Law, and put it in the side of the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord, that it may be there for a witness, &c.* But these Books, thus *Written, untill they were finished,* have manifestly received the Addition of the last Chapter of *Deutronomy* which was Written after the Death of *Moses;* as *Calvin* himself confesses. So *Gen.* 26. the 31. *verse* is clearly added by some Body, who lived in the times in which the Children of Israel had Kings: Which was long after the days of *Moses:* How then could he say, *And these are the Kings which Reigned in the Land of* Edom, *before there Reigned any King over the Children of Israel?* Who could set down these Kings as having Reigned untill the days of the Kings of Israel, but some Body who lived after their Reign? *Bonfrerius*, in his Preface to the *Pentateuck*, adds two other places, changed since *Moses* Writ them. That the like changes have happened to the Book of *Joshua*, to the fourth of Kings and to *Jeremy*, is witnessed by *Torniellus*, *Anno Mundi* 3612. But let no Man think, that I recount these changes as corruptions; for we all believe those Additions to have been made to the true Copies of *Moses*, and those other Writers by Men specially inspired by God to make them: Yet we standing only to the Humane Authority of History, cannot tell by whom those changes were made: No History telling us, that the Authors of these changes were Prophets, or Impostors. Only we have the Tradition of the present Church, assuring us infallibly (which She could not, if She were fallible) that the Scriptures, we now at present have, are infallibly Gods Word: And consequently, what changes so ever have been made in them, were made by sufficient Authority from God. You, who reject this Au-

Authority of the Church, can have no aſſurance that many other changes were not made, as well as theſe: And ſuch changes as may be moſt foul Corruption, for any thing you know. Again.

5. If we ſpeak of ſuch changes as may be both corruptions, and moſt pernicious corruptions, in the Hebrew Bible: You (who reject the Teſtemony of the Church as a fallible witneſs,) cannot poſſibly make it appear, that the Hebrew Copies are not groſly corrupted ſince the times of the Apoſtles: For many and great changes might, after their times, be made by the Jewiſh *Rabbins* (men moſt perfidious and malicious,) when they did add points to the Text, under pretence of preventing ſuch miſtakes, as might eaſily happen to the leſs skillfull, in reading the Hebrew Text; which to that day had no point to expreſs the Vowels: For in the Original it it was written only with Conſonants, and the Vowels were left to be added by the well inſtructed Reader; for whoſe help (in reading the Scriptures right,) the Jewiſh *Rabbins* did firſt begin to add certain points, ſo to tell us where an A, or an E, or any other Vowel was to be added according to the true manner of reading that place. Now only God knows whether theſe, ſo malicious and perfidious Jews, taught us to read every Vowel as it ſhould be read in ſuch a place. And did not, by the adding of what Vowels they pleaſed change the ſence of the Word, to ſignifie what they pleaſed. The putting of the Vowels right or wrong depended, not only upon the aſſuredneſs of their skill, which (for any thing we know) might in ſome places be deficient, and we not knowing theſe places, are ſure of no places: But alſo the putting of theſe Vowels depended primely on their ſincere, and upright honeſt dealing: Which we cannot, in true prudence, much expect from ſuch ſworn Enemies to Chriſtianity, as thoſe Jews were. Such men then as theſe putting all and every one of the Vowels, to every Word of the Hebrew Text a good while after the Apoſtles time: What humane evidence

have

have we, ſufficing to a certain aſſurance, of the adding the right Vowel to every Syllable of the whole Hebrew Bible? If wrong Vowels be added, the ſence will be incredibly wronged: The Vowel is the very Soul of the Syllable, either making, or marring the true ſound and ſignification, and altering it to moſt different ſences; In ſo much that, not only in every Word, but even in every Syllable, alteration may be made of the true ſenſe. So in the Latine Word *monere* to admoniſh, if you change the Vowels at your pleaſure (as thoſe Jewiſh *Rabbins* might often do, for any thing we know) you may read *moneri*, to be admoniſhed; *manere*, to ſtay; *manare*, to flow from; *minari*, to Threaten; *munire*, to Fence; *muniri*, to be well Fenced; *munera*, Gifts; *minora*, leſs things: And thus the Vowels change and alter the right Word in ſeveral parts. The Hebrew Language is moſt ſubject to this inconvenience of any other, becauſe it conſiſts exceeding much of Words of one Syllable; in which the change of the Vowel, makes the ſenſe a perfect changeling. So in *Engliſh*, ſuppoſe the Scripture ſhould ſpeak againſt the abuſes in *Bells*: There comes a *Proteſtant*, and he will ſay it is againſt the abuſes of Popiſh *Bulls*; there comes a *Puritane*, and he will ſay it is againſt the abuſe of *Bells*, uſing them in ſuch manners as have no Authority in Scripture; ſome upſtart Sectary will ſay it is againſt *Bills*, and other Arms, which Chriſtian mildneſs doth not allow of. See here how the change of one Vowel in one Syllable only, quite alters the ſenſe. This change of one Vowel makes *a fat man*, be a *fit man*: And *fatneſs* in all places, to be *fitneſs* in all places: It maketh that which is *Better*, to be *Bitter*: It makes *a Pot full of Butter*, to be *a Pit full of Batter*. Though you magnifie ſo much the preſent *Hebrew* Copy, as we have it now pricked and pointed, to point us out the true Vowels; yet your own *Engliſh* Bibles, in ſeveral places, teſtifie their Corruption, by forſaking their Tranſlation to follow ours: I will give you but one Example; We, *(and you with us)* Read, *They have pierced my Hands and my Feet*, *Pſal.* 22. *v.* 16. So

clear

clear a Propheſie for our Saviours Crucifixion, is quite turned to another ſenſe in the preſent *Hebrew* Copies, where theſe malicious *Jews* make us Read, *As a Lyon my Hands and Feet.* Thus you ſee how very little is the aſſurance, which thoſe, who know *Hebrew*, have, even of their very reading it Right as it ſhould be, according to the true meaning of the Scripture-Writer: Of *David* for Example, of whoſe true meaning, theſe falſe Pointers have diſappointed us. We then now have no aſſurance, to know what Vowels ſhould have been put. And if any Man now in theſe dayes, does pretend to be ſure that he has ſo much skill, as to tell by the Conſonants only, what Vowels ſhould for certain be put, according to the meaning of *Moſes*, of *David*, or of any other Writer; I would only deſire this cuning Man, to give me a Tryal of his skill, by telling me what Vowel I mean to have put to theſe three Conſonants, *Bll*: Whether I mean to ſignifie a *Ball*, a *Bell*, a *Bill*, *or* a *Bull*. You will ſooner tell me whether the Pins I hold now in my left Hand be even, or odd? Here you *will* be ſure to hit right at twice; for ſurely they be one of the two: But you may gueſs twice two times, before you aſſuredly Propheſie, whether I mean by thoſe three Conſonants to ſignifie *a Ball*, *a Bell*, *a Bill*, *or a Bull*.

6. Now for the Greek Copies; Tho' the Copy of the *Septuaginta* be not Original, yet Queſtionleſs, if we were ſure that we had the true Original of that Tranſlation, it would be a ſtrong ground, for as much as concerns thoſe Books which thoſe 70. Interpreters Tranſlated; who lived 300. Years before the New Teſtament was Written: But you your ſelves exceeding often refuſe in your Engliſh Bibles, to follow the preſent Copies of the *Septuaginta*, as Copies that are by you eſteemed corrupted in ſeveral places; and conſequently ſecure in no place, I ſhew this in ſeveral points of great conſequence. So *Pſ.* 118. *v.* 12. *I have inclined my Heart to perform thy Juſtifications for a reward:* St. *Auguſtin* upon this place, ſayes; *For which reward*, he ſaith, *he did incline his Heart to perform the Juſtifications of God:* Hence proving, as you ſee, that *David* did

did make profeſſion to do good Works, and to keep Gods commandements for the reward he hoped to get thereby. So the Scripture ſayes of *Moſes*, *That he had reſpect to the recompence of the reward*, and out of this reſpect did that moſt noble Act of *preferring the Ignominy of* Chriſt, *before the being great in the* Ægyptian *Court. Heb.* 11. *v.* 26. You to avoid this Argument drawn from the clear Text of the *Septuaginta*, flie from their Tranſlation, to the Hebrew Copy of a doubtful ſenſe, the one agreeing with the *Septuaginta*, the other agreeing to your turn of ſhifting off our and St *Auſtin's* ſenſe; by reading as you read, *I have inclined my Heart to perform thy Statutes alway even unto the end.* So in the fourth Chapter of *Daniel* v. 27. *Daniel* ſaid to *Nebuchodonozor*, *Redeem thy Sins with Almes:* Which Words are moſt literally Tranſlated out of the Copies of the *Septuaginta:* But becauſe they make ſo manifeſtly for Popiſh ſatisfaction, by which they hope to redeem their Sins, (*Chriſts* Paſſion dignifying their good Works;) you refuſe again to ſtand to the *Septuagint*, and flie again to the preſent *Hebrew* Copy; which having both the ſenſe of the *Septuagint*, and another ſenſe helping you to ſhift off this place, you follow that ſenſe and Read, *Break off your Sins by Righteouſneſs.* Hence it appears, that you yourſelves will not allow the true ſenſe of the Original Greek Copies of the *Septuagint.* And indeed St. *Jerome* finds frequent fault with the Copies he had in his dayes of their Tranſlation; (which tranſlation he reverenceth:) See him *in Quæſt. Hebr. de optimo genere interpretandi, Epiſt. ad Suniam & Fritillam:* And he often complains of the corruption of his Greek Copies in his Commentaries upon the Prophets. Now in our dayes *Bellarmine Lib.* 2. *de verbo Dei*, C. 6. Holds that the Copies of this moſt famous Tranſlation are ſo corrupted, that they ſeem to make a new, and quite different Tranſlation; as he proves by many arguments, of which one is this: *Geneſis* 26. Where the Servants of *Iſaac* do ſay, according to the Septuagint, *We have not found Water*: Whereas they ſhould

ſay,

ſay, *We have found Water*; as is proved by the Hebrew, and by *Iſaac* his own Words, calling the name of that place *Abundance*, for the plenty of Water found therein.

7. I come now to the new Teſtament, which almoſt all of it (except St. *Matthews* Goſpel) was by the Apoſtles themſelves Written in Greek. The chief points of our Faith depend upon the new Teſtament. If the Copies in this language agree not exactly, and in all places, (for falſity in one place proveth poſſibility of falſity in other places) with the firſt Copies written by the Apoſtles; our Judge (for whoſe ſole Authority you plead) will be convinced of Corruption, and therefore no infallible Judge. Your great Doctor *Beza* upon *Acts.* 7. 16. doth muſter up a whole Catalogue of Corruptions in the Greek Copies. The ſame *Beza* Judges *Eraſmus* the beſt of all latter Tranſlators; And yet *Eraſmus*, ſpeaking of the Sixth of St. *Matt.* condemns the Greek *of trifling and raſh Additions.* If you will be Judged by the Greek Copies, then you muſt confeſs that *Chriſt* in the Sacrament did give us his true Blood; For all the Greek Copies of St. *Luke* cap. 22. *v.* 20. Read thus. *This Cup is the New Teſtament in my Blood, which* (Cup) *is ſhed for you.* So that the *Cup*, that is the thing contained in the *Cup*, was that very thing which was ſhed for us; but not Wine, but Chriſts true Blood, was ſhed for us: Therefore not Wine, but *Chriſts* true Blood, was the thing contained in the *Cup*. It is a memorable thing which is lately related by Mr. *Creſſy*, *Exomol. cap.* 8. *nu.* 3. in theſe Words; " In my hearing, Biſhop " *Uſher* profeſſed, that whereas he had of many Years before " a deſire to publiſh the *New Teſtament* in Greek, with vari- " ous Lections and Annotations; and for that purpoſe had uſed " great diligence, and ſpent much Money to furniſh himſelf " with Manuſcripts: Yet in concluſion he was forced to de- " ſiſt utterly, leaſt, if he ſhould ingenuouſly have noted all the " ſeveral differences of reading which himſelf had Collected: " The incredible multitude of them almoſt in every Verſe, " ſhould rather have made Men Atheiſtical, then ſatisfie them " in the true Reading of any particular paſſage. An evident

" ſign that Governours of the Church did not rely only upon " what was in Writing. So he And tho' he has now twice Printed this, and tho' others have alſo divulged the ſame in Print; Yet Biſhop *Uſher*, ſeeing this done before his Eyes, does not diſclaim from it; Therefore I cannot but believe the Story to be true: And if it be true, how wonderfully corrupted is your only Judge. Now if B. *Uſher* alone, in this remote Corner of the World, being a private Man, could procure ſo many Old Copies in Writing; what might have been done by ſome great Prince uſing all induſtry to get (by means of other great Princes, and all other diligences,) all the Old Copies they could? For as the multitude of Copies procured by Biſhop *Uſher*, did increaſe the variety of different Readings; ſo a far greater multitude of Copies, would, in all probability have yet much more increaſed this variety and difference. And the ſame variety, for the ſame cauſe, might yet have been found to be far greater, if five or ſix great Princes, living in five or ſix Kingdoms (at the greateſt diſtance from one another,) ſhould have all conſpired to gather together all the ancienteſt Copies that were any where to be had. Wherefore, if in thoſe only Copies procured by Biſhop *Uſher*, the multitude of ſeveral Readings *were incredible almoſt in every Verſe*: How much more *incredible would* the multitude of ſeveral Readings be, if the diligence, I ſpoke of, ſhould be uſed to procure a greater multitude of Written Copies? I ask now, when in theſe later days Printing was Invented, how thoſe, who cauſed the Greek Tranſlation *(which we have)* to be Printed: How *(I ſay)* could they know for certain, that, that one Reading *(which they thought good to follow in their Printed* Copies*)* was the true Reading? Or how could any Man tell which Written Copy of B. *Uſhers* was the true Written Copy? I pray let us ſo much as know our Judge, before *we* be oblidged to accept of him in all matters. Yea, you make us know he is corrupted in many matters: And others may make us know that he is corrupted in many more. And ſure I am, that corrupted Judges, are not competent Judg-

ces.

es. Crooked Rules are not good Directors. The Rule that is given to us all by God, to direct us all, muſt be a Rule eaſily applyable by all: For this Reaſon, you ſay all muſt Read the Scriptures, and your meaning is (and muſt be) that they muſt Read the true Scriptures; that is, ſome true Copy of the true Books of Scripture: By what means ſhall they be aſſured, that they Read the true Copy, there being ſuch an incredible difference between Copies which are ſet forth for true? Not one, among an hundred thouſand, can have this aſſurance; either want of means to get the Reading of theſe Manuſcripts, or for want of skill to Read them, and underſtand them ſo, as to be able to inform himſelf of their perfect agreeing in points neceſſary: Eſpecially ſeeing that you ſo little agree in teaching us, which points are neceſſary and fundamental, that you could never yet be able to give us the number of them; much leſs to tell us which they were, or in what Books, or Chapters of the Bible, they were to be found. Wherefore he, who will upon his own knowledge, and not upon ſome other Mans credit, (far inferiour to a General Council,) inform himſelf of the Truth of his Copy (ſufficiently to have a full aſſurance that it is the true undoubted Copy of the true undoubted Word of God:) He (I ſay) who will ſo much as hope to do this, is not one among an hundred thouſand. How then can this be that Rule given by God, to be applyed by every Man, to Judge by it for himſelf: By which one among one hundred thouſand cannot be able to Judge for himſelf, whether this undoubtedly be that Rule given him by God. Excellently *Seneca*, *Omnia delibera cum amico, ſed priùs delibera de amico. All conſultations with thy ſure Friend make: But firſt conſult whom for this Friend to take.* Before thou conſulteſt the whole buſineſs of thine Eternity with this Copy, firſt conſult how ſure thou art of the ſureneſs of this thy Copy. If every Man (*as* Proteſtants *will have it*) are to be Judge for himſelf, in points which ſo nearly concern himſelf, then doubtleſs, in the very firſt place, he is to be Judge for himſelf of this point above all points, which concerns him

as much as that upon which all other points of higheſt concernment do wholly depend.

Thus you ſee, how not one Man among one hundred thouſand eſcaps being gulled by you; Whilſt you all make him believe, that if he will follow you, he ſhall ſee with his own Eyes, what he does, and he ſhall Judge for himſelf: And not take his Religion upon truſt, as you make them believe we do, becauſe we truſt General Councils. O deareſt Brethren in *Chriſt*, for his and for your own ſakes, ſet your Eyes at leaſt half open, and you ſhall preſently ſee, whether We, or You are thoſe who take up our Faith on truſt. Do We do this, becauſe We believe and truſt General Councils? Theſe Councils, even in Humane knowledge and ſincerity of Judgement, far excel any private Man, truſted by you in this Capital point: And, beſides Humane knowledge, they have the infallible aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt promiſed to them; at leaſt as much, if not more then to thoſe Men, whom you truſt. Or rather do not you take your Faith on truſt? For who of you is able to Judge for himſelf, Which is the true undoubted Copy of the true Word of God, by which only you muſt rule your Faith in all points? And who therefore is there among you, who ſeeing himſelf wholly unable to Judge for himſelf in this point, (*on which all others wholly depend*) is not forced to rely upon incomparable Weaker Authority, then is the Authority of a General Council, to which the prime Prelates of this World are called, bringing with them the ableſt Divines they can get, each one in the Province, from which he comes: And all of the Council delivering not ſo much their Opinion (equal at leaſt to *yours*) but delivering what hath been by them received Univerſally from their Anceſtors, without note of Novelty. Whereas you, when all comes to all, muſt in this very point of points, relie wholly on the Authority of thoſe few learned Men, who have thought good to ſet forth this Copy, which you take upon their Word to agree Faithfully in all places with the true undoubted Original. And this alſo muſt be done by you Mr. *Miniſter*

niſter, and *by you* Mr. *Doctor*, Without you be perhaps a Man more learned, then that one, who cannot be picked out among an hundred thouſand. Now if this be the caſe of Men, tho' ſo very learned; What more clear then that the leſs learned (*which make up the multitude of Souls redeemed by* Chriſt) cannot poſſibly Judge for themſelves in this point of points; but muſt truſt others to Judge for them, and relie wholly upon their Judgement. What think you now? Is this as ſafe as relying on the Church Univerſal, repreſented in a General Council? Now if this Council may be more Prudently relied upon in this point of high concernment; Why may it not be relied upon, and Judge for us, in points of leſs concernment? Shall I wiſely truſt a Man with a thouſand Pounds, and be unwiſe, if I truſt him with an hundred Pounds? Shall it be moſt prudently done, to let General Councils Judge for me, which Books I am to hold for the Copies of Gods Word, and ſhall it be imprudence to let a General Council Judge for me, whether I am to pray to Saints, or no? To pray for the Dead, or no? To hold *Chriſt* moſt Really preſent in the Sacrament, or no? What Scripture, or any thing like Scripture, have you, to tell me that the Church, repreſented in a Council, ſhall not deceive me in this point (moſt important of all points:) But that it may deceive me in other things, in which it is more eaſie to Judge Right? The Church is a Judge, (*as I ſhall ſhew hereafter*) to which the multitude of People may have free acceſs; and hear plainly, clearly, and moſt undoubtedly, what is delivered for true, by the Sentence of this moſt grave Judge: And ſuch a Judge it beſeemed the Divine Providence to give to the People, if he ſeriouſly deſired to bring them, by belief of the only true Faith, to Salvation. Whereas it is not poſſible, for one among one hundred thouſand, to hear plainly, clearly, and moſt undoubtedly, the Sentence delivered by any Book of Scripture, concerning the true Copy of the true Scripture; tho' all my Faith muſt depend upon this, as *you ſay*: Neither can you find any other Way to make me ſecure of this choice of

a true Copy, comparable to the Authority of a General Council.

8. To ſhew this more plainly, I will moſt faithfully relate unto you, that which you may ſoon ſee with your own Eyes, if you pleaſe. Your prime Maſters of Antiquity, your chief Doctors in all thoſe Languages, in which Scripture anciently was Written, have begun to ſet forth the moſt compleat Bible that ever yet appeared (as they ſay) for the number of the ancient Languages in which it is ſetting forth, and for the exquiſite exactneſs of the Copies, of which I ſpake *Sect.* 3. *n.* 9. The firſt five Books are already Printed, and to be ſeen in many Perſons Hands. The ſame Men have alſo (in order to their Bible) ſet forth an Introduction, Printed at *London* by *Tho: Roycroft*, Anno 1655. In the Preface to this Introduction, they profeſs, they cannot produce any one Copy, which the can aſſure us to agree in all things with the true Original Hand-Writing of the Authors; " *Wherefore* " (ſay they) *in the variety of Copies, what better Means* " *can ſo much as be invented, to pick out the true reading,* " *then the conferring of the moſt choice and moſt ancient Copies;* " *and then to ſtand to that reading, which agreeth beſt with* " *the greater part of the moſt ancient and moſt choice Copies?* " *This courſe St.* Jerome, *&c. This St.* Auſtin *took, &c. So* " *they.* The chief thing they pretend to excel others in, is *Exemplarium optimorum delectu, In the choiceneſs of the very beſt Copies.* Well now (dear reader) can Humane induſtry, ſuch as this is (that is, as great as is to be expected in this World by thee) take more pains, or do more, to procure for thee the trueſt Copies, which can be had for Love or Money? And, ſtanding in Humane induſtry, millions of millions have wanted this means of diſcovering the true Copy, which theſe Learned Men have. But what does all this avail another Man? For your Religion will have every one in point of Faith to Judge for himſelf: So *Dr. Ferne*, S. 8. thinks that, becauſe the *Roman Church* will have us to truſt to Her Judge-

Judgement, pronounced by and with the conſent of a General " Council; ſhe will have us to thruſt out our Right Eye, " the Eye of our Spiritual underſtanding, &c. Wherefore, " ſaith he we cannot yield, but muſt ſay, that no Man can " believe any thing truely, unleſs he be convinced of it in his " Judgement according to that Rom. 14. V. 5. *Let every* " *one be fully perſwaded in his own mind*; Concluding, by " the due uſe (note theſe Words) of his Reaſon, that it is " Gods Holy Will that they ſhould ſo do and believe. And by and by, he tells you, why he ſaid, that he muſt conclude (all that he is to believe) *by the due uſe of his Reaſon.* " *For* " *notwithſtanding the publick Judgement of the Church in a* " *full Counſel*, (I add notwithſtanding alſo, the private Judgement of ſuch great Doctors as theſe are, Who now ſo painfully labour in procuring the true Copy of the Bible for us.) " Private Chriſtians *(ſayes* Dr. *Ferne)* have their private Judg- " ment of Diſcretion for themſelves only, which is the diſcern- " ing, and receiving to themſelves only, as the Will of God, " what is delivered and propounded to them. For they muſt " anſwer alſo for themſelves, and live by their own Faith; which " cannot be without allowing them due uſe of their Reaſon and " Judgement, to ſee the evidence of that to which they muſt " aſcent. This is that which Dr. *Ferne*, and other Proteſtant Doctors are pleaſed to call, *The due uſe of Reaſon.* Behold here (you moſt learned Doctors, who ſo unwearedly ſweat in ſetting forth this your admirable Bible) behold a Doctrine taught every where by your own Divines, and moſt neceſſary to maintain your ſtanding out to ſubmit your inward Judgement to the definitions of Councils: A Doctrine, making all your labour of very little or no uſe at all, to your *Proteſtant* Brethren: For ſome ſeven or eight Years hence, when your Bible ſhall be quite ended, (for untill the quite finiſhing of it, we cannot have the benefit of it as a Judge) then your own Brethren muſt not truſt your Judgement, Judging for them in the choice of the true Copy, picked now out of one of your

Old

Old Copies, now out of another; now truſting to this Old Copy moſt in this Verſe, and by and by not truſting it moſt in the next, or almoſt in the next Verſe.

The due uſe of Reaſon (ſay they) permits us not to ſtand blindly to the publick Judgement, even of whole General Councils, when they define matters of leſs moment, then is the taking upon your Word, our Judge in all the points neceſſary to be believed or practiſed. For tho' in the ſecond Council of *Nice*, *Anno* 787. no fewer then three hundred and fifty Fathers, did allow of the Worſhip of Relicks an Holy Images of *Chriſt* and his Saints, *Act.* 3. Yet we have the private Judgement of Diſcretion to Judge for our ſelves, becauſe we are to anſwer for our ſelves; and *we* (duly uſing our Reaſon) Judge Worſhip of Images to be either Idolatry or Superſtition. *Now*, if you allow us, by your own Doctrine, not to truſt a whole General Council of three hundred and fifty Ancient Fathers; you have not *the due uſe of Reaſon* your ſelves, if you think *we may* Lawfully blind our ſelves ſo far as to let you Judge for us in a far more important point; that is, in the taking the only Rule of our whole Faith upon your Judgement. I muſt, in this point, have your leave not to accept of any one of your Copies, as ſufficiently true, to be my Rule in my whole Faith, Without I alſo can ſee the evidence of what I muſt aſcent unto: For ſo you teach me. See what I ſaid in the very end of the ſecond Section. But I go on, and confeſs that I ſee it is evident enough, that you do indeed ſay, that you give me the beſt Copies that can be got; and that, which is more, I ſee it is evident that you do indeed ſay all your Copies agree in things, which are neceſſary to Salvation: But I do not, nor cannot ſee (tho' one among one hundred thouſand are not ſo Learned as I) that all *you ſay* to me is evidently true, untill I have conferred all the Copies as well as you; and untill I are as fully certified of the Antiquity and choice exactneſs of all your Copies, as well as you; And this is impoſſible for me, untill I can underſtand all thoſe Languages as well as you; and peruſe all the authentical

Teſti-

Teſtimonies, which you have of this Antiquity, and perfect exactneſs of your Copies. Beſides all this, how can I truſt you to Judge in all and every point, whether the agreement of all the Copies are exact in all and every point Fundamental and neceſſary to Salvation: For I know, *we* our ſelves cannot agree which are all the points Fundamental and neceſſary; and my Judgement may in this vaſtly differ from yours, as much and as Lawfully as it differs from the Council I now ſpoke of. Thus much your own Brethren muſt be allowed to ſay.

9. As for our parts, *we*, to ſay nothing of what you mention concerning *Beza*, *Munſterus*, and *Eraſmus*, &c. *(from whom, as from profeſſed Enemies, we cannot without juſt ſuſpicion receive any thing)* *we* I ſay, beſides this, do not only ſuſpect, but alſo evidently know that you mainly diſagree from us in underſtanding the ſenſe of your own Words, when you ſay, "*There is* (in all the Copies you have by you) "*great agreement in all things belonging to Faith, and neceſ-*"*ſary to Salvation*, &c. And more towards the end, you ſay, "*That they agree in Fundamentals.* Biſhop *Uſher*, *(whoſe Copies you profeſs to uſe ſo much)* if he had gone on with his Work I ſpoke of *n.* 7. had given us better ſatisfaction in this particular, in that we had ſeen how great, and where the diſagreements be: But you make us rely wholly on your Authority in this point; I know you could not do otherwiſe. But as for your Judgement *in Fundamentals*, We know not how to rely on you; You tell us our Religion and yours agree *in Fundamentals:* If your Copies agree in Fundamentals no more then our *two* Religions; this agreement will be little to our ſatisfaction, nor much to the ſatisfaction of many of your Brethren: For being they know you account all the points, in which we and you diſagree, not to be points Fundamental or neceſſary to Salvation: They, by your granting frequent diſagreeing in your Copies in points not Fundamental, are not freed from, but confirmed in the ſuſpicion which many have, that the Copies of the Bible agree no better then *Papiſts* and *Pro-*

teſtants; and that (for any thing they can yet Judge by their own Judgement of Diſcretion) theſe your Copies diſagree about the Texts concerning the *Real Preſence; the Popes Supremacy; Image-Worſhip; Prayer to Saints; and for the Dead;* Yea about our Juſtification it ſelf; the number, the right uſe, the Fruit, the neceſſity of Sacraments; and ſuch points as theſe are; which, tho' you account them not to be Fundamental, yet you account them of ſo great concernment, that the difference in theſe points, gave you moſt juſt cauſe of ſeparating and dividing from the *Roman Church*, with all thoſe Scandals and publick Evils enſuing upon this diviſion. Will not then, this be a ſufficient Reaſon of not embracing the Copies preſented unto them in this moſt accurate Bible, they having no better aſſurance, that theſe Copies agree with thoſe other Copies concealed from them, in theſe points, *(in which their greateſt difference from the* Roman Church *does conſiſt)* then the Authority of theſe Learned Men, who moſt plainly confeſs the frequent differences of their Copies in points not Fundamental, and who alſo, by the Name *of points not Fundamental*, are known moſt commonly to mean ſuch kind of points, as contain no meaner differences then thoſe which are between *Papiſts* and *Proteſtants;* and which cauſed this great diviſion. A Word more of this Bible in the next *Sect. n. 5.*

10. To end then this matter, you ſee (*Gentle Readers*) That you have not among you any Copy, which you undoubtedly know, ſo much as by evidence of Humane knowledge to be Gods undoubted Word: Will you, who contend ſo eagerly to have nothing believed, for which there is not clear Scripture, have us, in the moſt important point of belief, believe that for which we have neither Scripture, nor evidence of Humane Reaſon? If you ſay the Divine Providence would doubtleſs keep the Copies of the Originals uncorrupted, becauſe otherwiſe we ſhould have no ſure Rule of Faith: I anſwer, that this is to ſuppoſe the very thing which is in Queſtion, *Whether* Chriſt *gave us Scripture for our only Rule.* Yea, becauſe it is clear that,

ſtand-

ſtanding in Humane evidence; no Copy can be freed of the guilt of Corruption: Therefore God would have no Copy at all to be our only Rule of Faith: But has provided for our direction another Way.

SECTION V.

A NINTH ARGUMENT.

That the Scripture cannot decide this Controverſie, which Tranſlations of the Word of God are true:

And therefore Ordinary Proteſtants cannot believe Scripture with Divine Faith.

1. THe Divine goodneſs deſiring paſſionatly (as appears by his Paſſion for all) the Salvation of all, and intending to make Faith a neceſſary means to this their Salvation, muſt conſequently provide ſome means to guide and direct us to the truth of this Faith; which muſt be a means ſo eaſie to be applyed by all, that all, by the uſe of this means, may (*if they will*) attain true Faith, which is *but one*; for *Faith unleſs it be one is not Faith*, as St. *Leo* ſaith *Ser. de Nativ.* Hence it appears, to the very Eye, that if the Scripture cannot ſo be uſed by all (or the far greater part) as to guide themſelves by it, in all points neceſſary to Salvation; it cannot be the only means given them for their guide in points neceſſary to Salvation: But it cannot do this to the far greater part of the World, as I prove; For the far greater part of the World cannot make uſe of Scripture in thoſe Languages, in which it was Written, as has been ſhewed in the laſt Section, even concerning Men, who are more Learned, then any one among one hundred thouſand; and it

is in it ſelf clear enough concerning thoſe who know not *Greek* and *Hebrew* in any perfect degree of knowledge, in which Languages the Scripture was Written: Whence it follows, that the far greater part of the World, cannot know what the true Word of God (*their only Judge and Director*) did ſay, but by the means of a Tranſlator or Interpreter. Now Judge you, in what uncertainty that Man ſhould be left, who ſhould have a very good guide locked up in ſome place; to which he himſelf could never have acceſs, but muſt hear all the directions given him by ſome other Man who is exceedingly ſubject to miſtake very many things, which that good guide ſhould ſay to him; eſpecially this Meſſenger being often to truſt others of no undoubted Credit: In this caſe, your own Doctrine does put you (O dear People) Who make Gods Word your only guide, in a Way full of a World of doubtful turnings, in which to miſs is everlaſtingly to periſh. This Word is locked up ſo in *Hebrew* and *Greek* Cloſets, that you cannot know what it ſaid, but by the uſe of a Tranſlator, as by a Meſſenger, who being a Man, and having a weak underſtanding, and a Will ſubject not to take all the pains required for the exact knowledge of all that, which the Word of God ſpeaks, in ſo great a Book as the Bible is, in which there are very many hard expreſſions in Languages nothing eaſie to be underſtood, in all Words and Phraſes; eſpecially ſeeing that the *Hebrew* Tongue was quite loſt (for as much as concerns the vulgar uſe) in the Captivity of *Babilon*, ſome ſix hundred Years before *Chriſt*. How hard then muſt it be now to know the full force, which common uſe gave theſe Words two or three and twenty hundred Years ago? What skill can be known to be here ſecure? Beſides the difficulty of the points of which I have ſpoken; I ſay nothing of the willfull miſtakes, which this Meſſenger may commit, either fully on ſet purpoſe, to make all go the Way which he conceives to be beſt, upon his paſſionate Affection to it, or Diſaffection to the contrary: Or rather, not ſo much with ſo plain down right willfulneſs; as with an overſwaying prejudice, which has pre-

poſ-

poſſeſſed his Judgement, that the Way which he, as from thy Guide, bidden thee to go, is the only true Way: Not that he is fully ſure that thy Guide did clearly *ſay* ſo; but thy Meſſenger thought beſt to put down clearly this Way for thy true Way, becauſe his own prejudice of its being ſo, and his great deſire that it ſhould be held by all to be ſo, have prevailed with him to deliver it clearly to be ſo. Moreover this thy Tranſlator or Meſſenger had not immediate acceſs to Gods Word, in that very Hand Writing in which it was Written by the Scripture-Writer; From ſuch but what he knows, he knows Copies as were Written by Men of unknown Fidelity, who perhaps often were ſuch hireling Pen-Men as had more care to Write much, that they might gain much; then to Write with all perfect exactneſs, and to take due pains and care in conferring their tranſcibed Copies with the Copies they tranſcribed. And thoſe very Copies alſo were perhaps Written out with the like careleſneſs. Beſides this careleſneſs; ignorance might likewiſe cauſe many a miſtake in ſo long a Work, becauſe all neither knew the Languages perfectly which they Tranſcribed, nor did nor perhaps know ſo cuntingly thoſe Abbreviations which thoſe Pen-Men then uſed even almoſt at every Word; in which alſo one Writer often differs from another: Hence in a long Work numberleſs miſtakes are incident, which ſoon grow to a far greater number, whilſt ſo many ſubſequent Tranſcribers out of former Miſtakers come to add their New miſtakes to thoſe former. And to do it in a Hand fit to cauſe their miſtakes to be yet more multiplied, when more Copies (ſubject ſtill to the like inconvenience) come to be Tranſcribed out of them ſucceſſively for many Ages. Now thy Meſſenger or Tranſlator in this vaſt Variety of Copies, *(of which we ſpoke more in the laſt chapter)* if he finds but one or two Copies, which more favour that Way which he would have all go, or thinks in his private Judgement to be true; he makes choice to Interpret this miſtaken Copy for Gods own Word, and ſets it down as advantageouſly as he can, to further his Opinion and his deſire to bring ſuch a Way into greateſt requeſt.

queſt. From ſuch Men as theſe, you are immediatly to take that direction for your only Rule and Guide: And yet, tho' you ſee with your Eyes, your only direction to come ſo indirectly to you; and, that you moſt manifeſtly neither do here Judge for your ſelves, nor can poſſibly Judge for your ſelves in this Capital point (*comprehending all the points you are to believe*:) Yet you are taught by all your prime Doctors, that, as you are to anſwer to God for your ſelves in all you believe; ſo you muſt, by your ſelves alſo Judge for your ſelves in all you believe. Yet (*O prepoſterous! O Monſtrouſly prepoſterous!*) You, in this chiefeſt point of all, muſt relie upon the Authority of a few *Engliſh* Tranſlators; who exact of you to relie on them with more confidence then they will permit you to relie upon the Authority of a whole General Council, ſeconded by the Authority of the graveſt Fathers which the Church of God has had: And You, who are Taught to follow and believe nothing but Scripture, are now Taught, without any one Text of Scripture to take the Tranſlations of Men for your only Guides, in all and every point of your Faith; and ſuch Tranſlations alſo as we juſt now deſcribed, and ſhall here more fully deſcribe. In the mean time note, that here I have one more neceſſary point, not clearly ſet down in Scripture, to add to the former ſixteen. If any deny this point to be neceſſary to Salvation, let him anſwer this Argument: That is neceſſary to Salvation, without which I cannot come to be aſſuredly guided to true Faith; But I (who underſtand not both Greek and Hebrew) cannot, without a truly Tranſlated Bible, come to be aſſuredly guided to true Faith; the true Bible being (*as you teach me*) the only Rule guiding and directing to true Faith: Therefore it is neceſſary for me, to uſe a truly Tranſlated Bible: But no Scripture does direct me in the choice of a truly Tranſlated Bible; Therefore Scripture does not direct me in all points neceſſary for me to Salvation.

2. Here again I infer, that all that vaſt number of People, who, knowing not perfectly both *Greek* and *Hebrew*, are forced

forced not to Judge for themſelves which is the true Word of God, muſt of neceſſity rely upon many uncertainties in this very point, upon which all their whole Faith doth rely. Firſt they muſt rely upon this uncertainty, whether the Copy which this Tranſlated Bible doth Interpret to them, were a true Copy of the true uncorrupted Word of God; which, how great an uncertainty it is, hath been ſhewed in the laſt Section; Where I ſhewed alſo (*and here you may ſee it again*) how much more you take your Religion upon truſt, then we do: Even thoſe great Doctors, who now ſet forth the famous Bible, Confeſs (in their *Introduction*) that *Copies are only ſo far Gods true Word, as they agree with the true Original Copy*, Written by the Prophets or Apoſtles. How thy Tranſlators Copy agrees with the true Original, God knows; I am ſure thou knoweſt not, nor thy Tranſlator himſelf. *Secondly, it is uncertain*, whether thy Tranſlator did in every place Interpret ſincerely, and not follow his own private Opinions, in expreſſing ſome points of Controverſie. *Thirdly, it is uncertain* whether he were not, in ſeveral places of ſo great a work, careleſs to expreſs the true ſenſe of his Copy, not marking at all times attentively enough, or not uſing at all times due labour to ſearch for the true ſenſe of ſuch and ſuch a Word, in ſuch and ſuch a place. *Fourthly, it is uncertain* whether thy Tranſlators skill was great enough to perform his Duty in ſo vaſt a Work as the Tranſlation of the Bible is, even tho' he ſhould uſe as great pains as he could. A Faith relying upon ſo many uncertainties, for certain cannot but be uncertain: But all the Faith, which ſuch Proteſtants have, is thus uncertain; unleſs they have skill and will to uſe the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Bible. Therefore their Faith is not certain nor Divine in any one point, becauſe in all points they rely upon a Tranſlators Authority, which is ſubject to ſo many uncertainties. See this clearly confeſſed by prime Proteſtant Doctors, whoſe Words I give you hereafter, *Sect.* 16. 11. 7.

3. And, that you may ſee this the clearer, I will ſet before your

your Eyes ſeveral undeniable Proofs of the groſs falſity which is in the Tranſlators of your own Religion, in whom you truſt moſt; that hence you may ſee, how little they are to be truſted by you in ſo great a matter; eſpecially to be truſted more then a General Council. *Luther* (that great beginner of this Reformation) did ſet forth a Tranſlation, which, how good it was you ſhall hear from your great Doctor *Zwinglius lib. de Sacra. fol.* 412. *Luther was* (ſaies he) *a foul Corrupter and horrible falſifyer of Gods Word. One who followed the* Marcioniſts *and* Arians *that razed out ſuch places of Holy Writ as were againſt him. Thou doeſt* (ſaies he to Luther) *corrupt the Word of God, thou art ſeen to be a manifeſt and Common corrupter and perverter of the Holy Scriptures. How much are we aſhamed of thee who have hitherto eſteemed thee*, &c. And *Luther* himſelf, twenty Years after, confeſſed he had often Erred becauſe he had truſted too much the gloſſes of the *Rabbins*; as witneſſes *Cochlæus in actis Lutheri*. Behold here another Way for Tranſlators to Err, of which we thought not before. It is alſo worth the noting which *Bellarmin* in his Sermon upon *Pentecoſt* ſays of *Luther*; *Thoſe* (ſaies he) *who moſt diligently have read the Books of Luther do bear witneſs that he, in the New Teſtament only* (ſo ſmall a part of the Bible) *hath changed above a thouſand places. He did ſet forth the Goſpels ſeven times, every time moſt different from all the former*, as the ſame *Bellarmine* there notes. So much for *Luther*. After him came *Zwinglius*, and ſet forth a Bible, with the help of his Diſciples, which being Printed at *Zurich*, the Printer ſent one of them to *Luther*: But he, rejecting it, ſent it him back again, as you may ſee in the *Proteſtants Apology Tract*. 1. *Sect.* 19. *Subd.* 4. out of which place I cannot be add diverſe moſt pertinent things to our preſent purpoſe. This Apology then ſets down all that here follows; as that *Luther* ſaid of thoſe *Zwinglian* Tranſlators, *that they were Fools, Aſſes, Antichriſts, Deceivers and of an Aſs-like underſtanding*. That *Beza* reproves *the Tranſlation of*

Oeco-

Oecolampadius (who with *Zwinglius* and *Caroloſtadius* did firſt begin your Reformation in point of the Real Preſence:) He then having ſet forth his Bible *at* Baſile, *Beza* ſaid thus of it; *The Baſilean Tranſlation is in many places wicked and altogether differing from the mind of the Holy Ghoſt.* The ſame great *Beza* accounts that ſo highly eſteemed *Tranſlation of* Caſtalio, *to be Sacrilegious, Wicked and Ethnical.* But *Caſtalio* was quit with *Beza*, for he writ a whole Book againſt the *Tranſlation which* Beza *made*, ſaying; *That to note all his Errors* (in Tranſlating) *would require a great Volum.* But *Beza* in his Annota: goes on and calls *Caſtolia* his Tranſlation *Falſe, Fooliſh, Unskilful, Bold, Blaſphemous, Vicious, Ridiculous, Curſed, Erroneus, Wicked, Perverſe.* Hitherto thou ſeeſt theſe Tranſlations of thy prime Doctors condemned by the Authority of other no leſs famous Tranſlators. And both thoſe who were condemned thus, and who did thus condemn, were Men more famous among you then is any one Tranſlator of any one Engliſh Bible: So that a great Authority, then is the Authority of that man (whoſe Tranſlation thou takeſt for the only Rule of Faith) tells thee that Tranſlations of far more learned Tranſlators then thine, be ſo full of Corruptions, that great Volums would not contain them: How then canſt thou hope that they leſs skilfull Engliſh Tranſlator hath done his part better then any of thy greateſt Doctors. But I muſt yet further ask thee, how thou doeſt know this on thy own knowledge? and how it is poſſible for thee here to Judge for thy ſelf, which thy Doctors ſo often tell thee thou ſhalt be able to do if thou wilt follow them? Doeſt not thou here again ſee how in a moſt important point, thou art enforced to truſt an incomparable leſs Authority then that is of any one of our General Councils, which they ſo ſtrictly charge thee not to truſt even in far leſs points? O blindneſs!

4. But thou canſt not but ſee how much thou art gulled herein, and how impoſſible it is for thee to Judge of truth and Faith by theſe *Engliſh* Tranſlations, when thou ſhalt yet hear what

I have to ſay of them. *Your firſt* Engliſh *Bible* was ſet forth in the dayes of *Henry* the Eight, *by Tindal*, whom Yours eſteem *the Apoſtle of* England *in this Reformation*. May I not truſt him will *you ſay? Truly Biſhop* Tunſtal *noted no leſs then two thouſand Corruptions in his Tranſlation in the New Teſtament only*, as witneſſes the *Romiſh* Teſtament in the end of *the Table of certain places*, &c. How little a part of the Bible is the New Teſtament? And *yet two thouſand* Corruptions *in that only*? Yet ſurely in Queen *Elizabeths* days, who lived ſo very long, and did ſee the Goſpel ſo well perfected, our Tranſlations *(wilt thou ſay)* were compleatly exact: For then, if ever our Doctors had the true Spirit. Indeed then they were ſo confident their Tranſlations did agree with the Word of God, that the Queen *(whom all your Doctors by Oath acknowledge Governeſs of your Church in* England *)* in the 26. Year of Her Reign *(as Sr.* Richard Baker *Writes in that Year)* did command *Whitgift* Her Arch-Biſhop of *Canterbury*, to ſet forth three Articles to be ſubſcribed by all Her Clergy, and the ſecond of theſe was, *That the Book of* Common-*Prayer contained nothing contrary to the Word of God*. By Reaſon of the urging this Subſcription, many marking well that in their Common *Prayer* their Epiſtles, Goſpels, Pſalms, &c. were contained, all which were taken out of their Bible: And knowing by their Learning that their Bible, even then, was full of groſs Corruptions, contrary to the Word; began now openly to diſcover theſe Errors. Hence divers Miniſters *in a Treatiſe to Her Excellent Majeſty ſpoke thus; Our Tranſlation of the Pſalms, comprized in our Book of Common Prayer, does in Addition, Subſtraction, and Alteration, differ from the truth of the Hebrew in two hundred places at leaſt*. And Mr. *Burges* in his *Apology* S. 6. Writes thus; *How ſhall I approve under my Hand a Tranſlation which has many Omiſſions, many Additions, which ſometimes obſcures, ſometimes perverts the ſenſe, being ſometimes ſenſeleſs, ſometimes contrary*. And *Carliel*, ſaies in his Book of *Chriſts* Deſcent to Hell, p. 116.

The

The Tranſlators thereof (the Engliſh Bible then uſed) *have depraved the ſenſe, or obſcured the truth, and deceived the Ignorant. In many places they detort the Scripture from the right ſenſe; and finally they ſhew themſelves to love darkneſs more then Light, Falſhood more then Truth.* When King *James* began now to Reign, *the Miniſters of* Lincoln-ſhire, *in an Abridgement of a Book delivered to the King.* P. 11. 12. of the Engliſh Tranſlation ſpeak thus: *It takes away from the Text, adds to the Text, and this ſometimes to the changing or obſcuring of the meaning of the Holy Ghoſt. A Tranſlation which is abſurd, and ſenſeleſs, perverting in many places the meaning of the Holy Ghoſt.* Theſe things were ſo notorious, that Sir *Richard Baker*, an earneſt Old Proteſtant (*as now they call them*) in the firſt Year of King *James* his Reign writes thus: *He called to* Hampton Court *divers of his Biſhops and Divines, to ſee what they could ſay againſt the preſent Government of the* Engliſh Church. *In this conference Dr.* Reynolds *motioned that there might be a New Tranſlation of the Bible; becauſe the preſent Tranſlations were corrupt, and not anſwerable to the truth of the Original; whereof he alledged divers examples, particularly that in the hundred and fifth Pſalm.* v. 28. *where it is ſaid, They were not obedient; in the Original it is, they were not diſobedient. To this it was agreed that a New Tranſlation ſhould be made.* Thus far Sir *Richard* Word for Word. By all which it is evident that your Biſhops, Doctors, Divines, &c. In Queen *Elizabeths* dayes, even to Her laſt Day, did ſubſcribe, and by Publick Authority were ordered to ſubſcribe, that falſified Word of God to be the true Word of God; tho' it were flatly contrary (as in the place now cited) to the true Word. How knoweſt thou that the Divines now, tho' they miſs not alway in the ſame places perhaps, yet perhaps they may miſs in others of as great conſequence? The Scripture was held then as confidently to be the only Rule of Faith, and cited as faſt, and as thick, for Gods Word then, as it is now; And yet now your very Bible coming forth on that

occaſion, does as good as tell you; the former Bible was not Gods true Word. Divers Years after the reſolution made of ſetting forth this New Bible, there ſtill remained ſuch open complaints of the Corruptions of the Word of God, that Mr. *Broughton* (a Man as skillfull in Hebrew and Greek as any was in *England*) according to his skill did give this Cenſure in *his Advertiſement of Corruptions to the* Biſhops; ſaying, That *their publick Tranſlation of Scriptures into* Engliſh *is ſuch as it perverteth the Text of the Old Teſtament in eight hundred forty eight places; and that it cauſes Millions of Millions to reject the New Teſtament, and to run to eternal Flames.* In what caſe then has this your Doctrine put you, which has taken you off from following the Judgement of the Church in a General Council, to make you Judge for your own ſelves: When your Learnedeſt Divines (who made ſo Corrupted Tranſlations) did ſo ill Judge for them and others? Upon thy ſelf then thou canſt not ſafely relie in this point; neither canſt thou relie upon thy Tranſlators, who have uſed thee thus: Find me then, for Gods ſake, find me, if thou canſt, any where any but half ſo ſure a ground as is that of the Church, which is the *Pillar and Ground of the Truth.* Thou doeſt not only venture the being deceived in this great point of the uprightneſs of thy only Rule, and Judge; but it is manifeſt that thou art deceived: For, thy Rule (*which is thy preſent* Engliſh Tranſlated Bible) ſtill ſtands accuſed of many and groſs Corruptions. Not to trouble thee much, I will tell thee only of one or two; Thy Tranſlator had a mind to make thee believe that Faith only could Save thee; a damnable Doctrine, unknown to the greateſt Doctors of the Church, which could not be, were it the only thing which did juſtifie and Save us, as thy Tranſlator would perſwade thee, when Tranſlating what *Chriſt* ſaid to the Blind Man, whom he cured, *Luke* 18. 43. he makes *Chriſt* to ſay, *thy Faith Saved thee*, in place of ſaying, *thy Faith hath made thee whole.* Again, tho' *Chriſt*, *by way* of Counſel, did propoſe in a General manner the embracing of a chaſte ſingle Life, *Matt.* 19. *v.* 11. &

12.

12. saying; *He that is able to receive it, let him receive it*: Thy Translator had a mind to make thee believe not only that every one did not receive this Doctrine, but he makes *Christ* in the former verse tell us, *All Men cannot receive this saying*. Whereas *Christ* said only, *All Men do not receive this saying*, as is evident out of the Greek. Is this fair dealing? Is it all one to say, *All Men do not lead single Lives;* and to say, *All Men cannot lead single Lives*, tho' they use Fasting, Praying, &c. This is as willfull an Error, as it would be in one who heard me say (and also set it down in Writing to prevent mistake) *All Men are not Honest;* should report that I said, *All Men cannot be Honest.* When I see a Translator not to make any Conscience of so wilfully falsifying Gods own Word, in favour of his own Opinion; have not I just reason to say, I cannot be sure of my Faith in all points, if I (*upon this Mans Autority*) take his Translation as the only Rule of my Faith in all points? What more clear?

5. Here I must needs examin the Doctrine which those great Masters of the Ancient Languages, who now set forth that mighty Work of the *London* Bible, in so many Learned Ancient Languages, who in the Introduction to this their Bible (of which I spoke in the last *Sect. n.* 8.) spoke thus; *It is not necessary for the producing Faith in the People, that there should be a* Translation *wholly infallible; seeing that* de facto *it is evident, that among those numberless* Translations *which are extant this day in* Europe, *there is none of all them which is of Divine and infallible Authority: For Faith does rely on the Authority or Veracity of God, which always is certain and infallible, altho' all the means are not infallible; For* Translations *have only so far Authority as far as they agree with the first own-hand Written Original: But they are sufficient means of Faith when they contain* (who knows when that is?) *all things necessary to Salvation, without any Error against Faith or good Manners.* So they. Let us examin, what they say, by parts as it lies in order, and that in order to our present purpose only:

And

And not in order to examin how true all they ſay is. If true Faith can be had now without any infallible Tranſlation, then the Bible is not our only Guide to true Faith, and our only Judge in points Controverted in Faith: For this Judge muſt be infallible, as all your Doctors teach If you anſwer the Judge is not the Tranſlated Copy, but the Orignal in Greek and Hebrew. I ask you, what ſhall almoſt all the World do to hear this infallible Judge ſpeak? For almoſt all are Deaf to all that is ſpoken in Greek and Hebrew. If there be not one infallible Tranſlation in *Europe* at this day; how at this day are all deſuded, who are taught on the one ſide to Judge for themſelves, and on the other ſide are told that they cannot handle the Ruler by which they ſhould Rule their Judgement in all points; But they muſt be contented with a fallible *Lesbian* Rule of Lead, bent as it pleaſed the Tranſlator? Again, how is it poſſible God ſhould bid the People to ſearch the truth in the Bible, not only as the only place to find it in; but alſo as the only place for them to find it in: For God knew all People could not ſearch truth in any Bibles, but ſuch as are Tranſlated into a Language they underſtand; God knew all theſe Tranſlations were Lyars, if indeed they be ſo as you ſay; Can God bid any man ſeek for the truth, only at a Lyars Mouth? Yea, would God, who loves Souls ſo well, give them no better means to know the truth wholy neceſſary to Salvation? True it is, Faith doth rely upon the truth of God, who ſaid ſuch a thing to be ſo and ſo: But if my Tranſlator tell me; that God ſaid ſuch a thing was ſo and ſo; and yet God ſaid no ſuch thing, but an other thing very different, in place of which my Tranſlator ignorantly or willfully obtrudes this thing: Here manifeſtly I am left leaning, with all my force, upon a Lie. And whereas you tell us that Tranſlations (the only Rule we can handle) *have only ſo far Divine Authority as far as they agree with the firſt own-hand-written Originals;* This is ſmall comfort to us, to whom it is impoſſible to know how far this is. Yea you your ſelves know not which be the true own-hand-written Ori-

Originals, which you confeſs to have periſhed, tho' you ſay that they are Faithfully reſtored by your laborious gathering and conferring together more exquiſite Copies then hitherto have been publiſhed: Which how true it is, I know not. And then ſecondly, without we alſo know the Languages, which you preſent unto us very Faithfully, (as we perhaps ſuppoſe,) it is impoſſible for us to know how far our Tranſlations agree with the Originals: Therefore it is impoſſible for us to know how far we may truſt to their Authority as Divine, or ſuſpect it as Humane. And ſo by clear conſequence it is impoſſible for us to when and where we may give a moſt full undoubted aſcent to what we find Tranſlated in our Bibles. Is this the comfort you leave us at laſt, when upon our leaving to relie upon the Rock of the Church, you promiſed to make us Men knowing what we do in all points: And now, we are ſure we know not what we do in any? For we know not what our only Rule bids us to hold upon Gods Authority, or what that Man bids us upon his Authority only to hold, when offering us his own Tranſlation, he bids us take it for a Divine Rule; which if he gives not, we are gulled even in that point which neareſt concerns our Salvation. Indeed you conclude with a ſmall crumm of Comfort, when you tell us; *Tranſlations are ſufficient means to Divine Faith, when they contain all things neceſſary to Salvation, without any Error againſt Faith or good Manners.* But I pray reflect, how wholly impoſſible it is for us to tell when they do this, without knowing firſt for certain all the points neceſſary to Salvation: About which you your ſelves are not agreed; neither can you give us up a Liſt or Catalogue of them. Nay, I may affirm, that no ſuch Liſt or Catalogue can be given, *(tho' even here it be ſo apparently neceſſary)* that thence we might ſee whether there are any ſuch Error in our *Engliſh* Bibles, in thoſe matters. Yea, all of you tell us, that there is no Way to know what is neceſſary to Salvation, but by the true Bible; and yet we (Poor Souls) cannot poſſibly come to know, which is the true Bible containing all points neceſſary to Salvation

tion, without any Error in Faith or Manners; untill we know firſt that a true Bible has told us ſo: And again, we cannot know that Bible to be ſo true, which told us ſo; untill we know that, that very Bible contained all points neceſſary to Salvation, without any Error in Faith or Manners. This is not only to blind us *(as you ſay the Papiſts do, when they make us follow the Church:)* But it is to uſe us as the *Philiſtians* uſed *Samſon;* firſt to put out our Eyes, and then to make us run round in a Mill, as blinded Horſes do in Horſe Mills: For no Circle is rounder, and goes more about and about again in the ſame Foot-ſteps, then the Circle we are made run in blind-fold; by having no other aſſurance, that the only Rule of all our Faith is a Bible containing all things neceſſary to Salvation, without Error againſt Faith and Manners; and having no other aſſurance of what is neceſſary to Salvation, what not; what is againſt Faith, what not; what is againſt Manners, what not; but by an other Bible, of which Bibles Truth we have no other aſſurance then the former; but we ſtill require another Bible to aſſure us of the like things; and this other will require another, an ſo without end. What Circle can be more endleſs?

SEC

SECTION VI.

A TENTH ARGUMENT.

That the Scripture cannot decide the Controverſie about the truth of St. Matthews *Goſpel.*

And that our Adverſaries do not believe this Goſpel with Divine Faith.

1. HEre alſo I muſt needs propoſe a difficulty, which, in the principles of your Religion, I conceive to be unanſwerable. You do no leſs believe all things Written in St. *Matthews* Goſpel, then you believe all things Written in any other Book of the Scripture: But even your Doctors of the higheſt Form, have no other Authority for all things in St. *Matthews* Goſpel, but the Authority of a Tranſlation made by one, whom none of us all know; and ſo we can neither aſſure our ſelves of his Fidelity, nor of his skill, nor of his care to uſe a true Copy, nor I of his Induſtry in the uſe thereof, &c. Now you tell us (and it is true) that Tranſlations *(preſcinding from any Decree of the* Church *approving of them)* have only ſo far Authority, as far as they agree with the true Original; but it is impoſſible for you (great Doctors) to know how far the Tranſlated Copies of St. *Matthews* Goſpel agree with the Original; becauſe, for theſe many Ages, there has not been known extant in the whole World, any one Copy of the Original hand-Writing of St. *Matthew*, who did Write in that kind of Hebrew which the *Jews* ſpoke in his dayes, as all and every one of the Ancient Fathers *(who have Writ of this matter, and whoſe Works we have)* do teſtifie, and St. *Jerome libro de Scriptorib. Eccleſiaſticis* affirms himſelf to have ſeen, and

to have alſo Written out that *Hebrew* Copy. But for theſe many Ages no one *Hebrew* Copy has appeared in the World, which with any ſufficient probability, could be ſhewed to be a true Copy: Whence it is evident, that none of you all can tell, how far the Tranſlations we have of that *Hebrew* Copy, do agree with the *Hebrew* Copy; therefore, not one of you all can tell how far theſe Tranſlations, which we have now, are of Divine Authority, and how far now we may admit them as Gods undoubted Word; there being no Reaſon known to us, why we ſhould admit them more in one place (upon St. *Matthews* Authority) then in an other: And there being no Reaſon why we ſhould admit of the whole Tranſlation, made by I know not whom, rather then of other Tranſlations, whom we know, to have been made with all the beſt Induſtries which Humane Ability can afford: Whence I can neither admit the whole Tranſlation as Divine, nor any part of it, rather then the part I admit not; I not knowing any one part to agree more with the true Original, then the other. All the whole Goſpel I cannot receive as Divine, for no Tranſlation at all, (much leſs the Tranſlations of a Man *unknown*) is to be admitted as Divine and infallible, there being no one ſuch in all *Europe* as you ſay. Hence I demonſtrate, that you believe not St. *Matthews* Goſpel with Divine Faith: For you cannot ſay, that you give credit to any one thing in it for the Authority of the Writer of it, becauſe you know not any one thing delivered from God by the Writer unto you, but upon the Authority of the Tranſlation, which is no further Divine then agreeing with the true Copy; which agreement you neither know to be in this one point, or any other you can Name. How can I know, how the Tranſlation agrees with the Original: If I know not what the Original ſaith?

2. Again, to believe St. *Matthews* Goſpel, is as neceſſary to Salvation, as to believe St. *Lukes* or St. *Johns*; but no infallible Scripture (Tranſlations being infallible) does tell you that St. *Matthews* Goſpel is the undoubted Word of God; how will

will you then prove this by Scripture againſt the *Marcioniſts*, the *Cerdoniſts*, and *Manicheans*, who deny this Goſpel to be Gods Word? All points neceſſary to Salvation, you ſay, are plainly ſet down in Scripture: Shew me this point plainly ſet down. Here then I have one neceſſary point more, not plainly ſet down in Scripture which makes the former ſeventeen points to be eighteen. Neither can you ſay, that by the very Reading this Tranſlation, you can diſcover a Light ſhewing it as clearly as the Sun, to be Gods Word: For, tho' I can ſee no Reaſon, why ſuch Light might not be diſcovered, as well in true Tranſlations, as in true Originals; yet becauſe you of your Religion, who only have Eyes to ſee this Light, do profeſs (as *we* have lately ſeen your greateſt Scripture-Doctors to profeſs) that there is not one infallible Tranſlation in *Europe;* and becauſe we ſee, even ſuch Doctors as they are, not ſo much as to hope to diſcover, by ſuch a Light, true Tranſlations from falſe ones; but to beſtow great pains in conferring the ſeveral Copies of their ſeveral Tranſlations, with the beſt Copies of the Originals which they can find; and by the agreeing, or not agreeing with theſe beſt Copies, to approve or reprove the Tranſlations; *we* are by this certified, that they truſt nothing to this clear Light, which if it were a Reallity, and not a real Fancy, *were* the beſt Guide of all, and would ſave them infinite pains: Yea, whatſoever (to avoid our Arguments) they boaſt of this Light; yet even in the approving or reproving the Copies of the Original it ſelf, they truſt nothing to it. If I thought, they did truſt to ſuch an ungrounded Imagination, neither I, nor any one of my Opinion (nor of thine neither, as I think) would ever buy one Copy of their Tranſlations.

3. *Now;* if you cannot diſcover any ſuch Light aſſuring you of the Truth of all things in St. *Matthews* Goſpel, I am ſure you cannot do ſo in St. *Johns* or St. *Lukes*, or any other: And your *own* Conſciences cannot but tell you, that the Light diſcovering its ſelf in St. *Matthew*, is as great as in any other Book of Scripture; But this Light is now clearly ſhewed to be unſuffi-

cient to prove St. *Matthews* Goſpel to be Divine, it being only a Tranſlation, which your beſt Doctors confeſs to be fallible: Neither is there any means to know one part of it to be more infallible then another, upon the Authority of the Writer thereof; becauſe we know not which agrees with the true Copies of the Writer. You ſay you fix your Faith upon what is Tranſlated, and not upon the Tranſlation: But I ſay, if you fix your Faith upon what is Tranſlated by a falſe Tranſlator, you may ſoon fix your Faith upon a Lie; at leaſt you cannot tell when you do ſo, and when you do not; For you know not whether the thing delivered be agreeable to Gods Word, or only to the Interpreters Fancy; eſpecially when you know not of what credit the Interpreter is. Do you know it becauſe your Fancy alſo tells you this is Gods Word? Then thus we may have a double Phantaſtical aſſurance, and nothing elſe; one from the unknown Interpreters Fancy, another from thy own. I thought your Faith had relied on Gods Written Word. What Written Word is that which can neither be ſhewed aſſuredly Written in any Original, nor in any Copy, nor in any Tranſlation of the Original Copy? If you flie at laſt to that miſerable ſhift, as to ſay, that the Illumination of the Spirit can tell you Gods Word, without the Meditation of any certain undoubted means, conveighing it unto you: Then you muſt needs be Prophets all, and every one of you. Who ever heard of ſuch a Church in this World, in which there are as many Prophets as there are Men and Women? This is not the Church of St. *Paul*, in which he ſaid, 1 *Cor.* 12. 19. Be all! Prophets? And in which *he gave only ſome Prophets. Eph* 4. 11. But all of you who know, imediatly from God, that which no mediate means conveighs unto you, muſt needs be true Prophets. If this is true, then alſo any *Engliſh* Clown, by the like Illumination, communicated to him in the Reading of his *Engliſh* Tranſlaiton, may as well, and better, (becauſe by Divine Illumination) be aſſured, that all is true which is in his *Engliſh* Tranſlated Bible; and ſo, by good conſequence, be aſſured that

that it is a very true Tranſlation; tho' he neither knew *Greek*, nor *Hebrew*. And indeed your *Greek* and *Hebrew* only helps you to conſer the Tranſlation with the Originals; but St. *Matthews* Original Copy not being for many Ages viſible in the World, can be no more conferred with by your *Hebritians*, then by this *Engliſh* Clown: And is his Illumination aſſures him of all that is Written in St. *Matthews* Goſpel; We will all with one conſent, grant that it may aſſure him as well that all other Parts of the Scriptures be Gods Word: What then need you talk of conferring with the Originals, or knowing Greek or Hebrew?

4. Now at laſt, I hope, when you ſo Univerſally allow to every Man and Women who believes St. *Matthews* Goſpel, ſo large a meaſure of Divine Illumination, that it is ſufficient to ground an infallible belief; You will confeſs your ſelves to ſpeak moſt inconſequently, if you offer to deny the like Illumination to the whole Church repreſentative in a General Council: So now we ſhall have a Church infallible; which is all I am endeavouring here by Degrees to prove. And tell me not, that you are not aſſured, whether they in Councils have uſed the due means to obtain this Illumination; for I ſhall as eaſily tell you, that neither I, nor my Brethren, are aſſured that you, and your Brethren, have uſed alſo the due means to obtain this Illumination concerning every Book, Chapter and Verſe of Scripture, aſſuring them all to be Gods Words; eſpecially when they ſpeak Contradictions ſo vaſt as *we* ſee they do.

SEC-

SECTION VII.

A ELEVENTH ARGUMENT.

That the Scripture cannot decide the manifold Controverſies about the true ſenſe of Scripture.

Therefore in their belief of the true ſenſe thereof, our Adverſaries have no Divine Faith; Nor no ſure Ground of their Religion.

1. IN the former Sections I have given you eighteen points, all neceſſary to Salvation, and yet not one of them plainly ſet down in Scripture: Now I add a nineteenth point, which, tho' moſt neceſſary, yet it is ſo far from being cleared by only Scripture, that almoſt all our Controverſies do ariſe from hence, without ever being ſilenced by the definitive Sentence of God, delivered in the Bible: An evident ſign that God, in the Scripture only, hath not paſſed the clear deciſive Sentence of all neceſſary Controverſies: For all parties ſubmit unto that Sentence, and yet none of them is clearly caſt thereby. They do then the Holy Scripture much wrong, who ſay that God did Write it on ſet purpoſe to end all Controverſies: And yet they cannot poſſibly ſhew how God hath done this compleatly: And ſo, by conſequence, they are driven (to the ſcandal of all Chriſtians) to make God fall ſhort of effecting that by Scripture, which they ſay he intended to effect; to wit, the ending of all Controverſies; which with our Eyes we all ſee wax endleſs even among thoſe, who all ſubmit to Scripture as Gods Word. We *Roman Catholicks* are far from doing the Holy Ghoſt this wrong: We ſay, Scripture was dictated by him, for many moſt high ends belonging to the knowledge and love of God, and belonging to the

the increaſe of all Vertue and hatred of Sin, arming us with Patience in Gods Service, by propoſing moſt comfortable motives to us: So St. *Paul* teaches us *what things ſo ever have been written, to our learning they are written, by the patience and conſolation of the Scriptures we may have* Hope, and thus walking chearfully by thoſe comfortable Examples, and theſe rare Documents, and fervent Exhortations given us in Scripture to all Vertue, we may gain the end for which God made us. Yea we add that Scripture wants not this Honor of providing ſufficiently for our unity in Faith, about all points which can ever fall in Controverſie; not that it ends all theſe by it ſelf alone: But that it bids us have our recourſe, in theſe caſes, to his Church, and to *hear Her*, and that under pain of *being accounted as a Publican or Heathen;* and telling us, *that the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt Her*, by any falſe Doctrine; telling us, that *She is the Pillar and Ground of Truth;* that *He is with Her all dayes, even to the conſummation of the World;* and that *He hath Prayed his Father to give Her another Comforter, that He may abide with Her for ever, the Spirit of Truth, who ſhall teach & ſuggeſt unto Her all things whatſoever* Chriſt *hath taught his Apoſtles, guiding Her into all Truth.* He tells us alſo that he has given us ſuch Doctors, and ſuch Paſtors, as may ſecure Her *from circumvention of* of Error; for his Covenant with Her is this, *My Spirit which is upon thee and the Words which I have put in thy Mouth; ſhall not depart out of thy Mouth, nor out of the Mouth of thy Seed, nor out of the Mouth of thy Seeds Seed, from heace forth and for ever.* And that *Her Sun ſhall no more go down;* For *the Lord will be unto Her an everlaſting Light;* *ſhe* ſhall be *a Kingdom ſtanding for ever;* that *the Nation and Kingdom which ſhall not ſerve Her, ſhall periſh.* No National Synods ſhall juſtifie any Nations diviſion from Her Communion. All theſe Texts I ſhall ſhew to be ſpoken of the Church; by which (I think) it is a appartent by Scripture, that God intended not in Controverſies of Faith, to inſtruct

us

us by Scripture only; the very Scripture ſending us ſo often to the Church, as alſo to Her Traditions; as 2 *Theſ.* 2 15. *Hold ye faſt*, and (to do this) *hold the Traditions which ye have learned, whether by Word, or by Epiſtle*: And again, 2 *Tim* 2. *The things which thou haſt heard of me by many witneſſes* (he ſaies not by his writting only) *theſe commend to Faithful Men, which ſhall be fit to teach others alſo*: And again, *Thoſe things which you have been taught, and heard, and ſeen in me, theſe do.* Who ſees not what we were to do, not only what we had Read, but what had *been taught* us, and what we had only heard or ſeen ſhining in publick Practice. But of this here after ſee in the next *Sect. n.* 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. God then teaches us all things neceſſary in Scripture; firſt, by delivering many things clearly in it; ſecondly, by ſending us for the reſt to the Church, and to Her Traditions: By the Churches Paſtors alone He inſtructed ſome ſufficiently in Faith; as he did St. *Paul*, to whom it was ſaid, *Act.* 9. 6. *Go into the City, and it ſhall be told thee what thou muſt do*; and as he did *Cornelius*, to whom it was likewiſe ſaid; *Call for one* Simon, *whoſe Surname is* Peter *and he will tell thee what thou oughſt to do. Act.* 10. *v.* 5. 6. What you object to the contrary I anſwer *Sect.* 10. *n.* 6.

2. I return to you, who ſay, God intended by Scripture only to teach us all neceſſary points; which if he has not done, you make him deficient in an unworthy Manner: And that he has not done it I have already ſhewed in eighteen neceſſary points: And now I add, that by Scripture alone he does not teach us the true ſenſe of Scripture: And yet the true ſenſe thereof is that which muſt give Sentence in the deciſion of all Controverſies; the ſenſe is the Kernel, the Life, the Soul of the Text; miſs that, miſs all; A wrong and falſe ſenſe is no leſs dangerous then a falſe Text obtruded for a true one. Hence *Tertull.* de Præſcrip. *The ſenſe adultered is like perilous as the ſtile corrupted.* And St. *Jerome* Ep. ad Gal. ſaies. *The Goſpel is not the Word but in the ſenſe; not in the bark, but in the*

ſapp.

ſapp. Wherefore Dr. *Reynolds* in his Conference with Mr. *Hart p.* 58. confeſſes, *that it is not the ſhew, but the ſenſe of the Words, that muſt decide Controverſies.* So he. It is not then the Text as it ſounds, but the Text thus Expounded, which muſt end *(as you ſay)* all our Debates: And yet this Expounding thus or thus, is that very thing which firſt makes all our prime Debates and Controverſies; and it is alſo that very thing which makes them to be endleſs. This I ſtill inculcate, becauſe.

3. This, and the true Reaſon of this, is exceedingly to be noted: For it is not the Text, but the Text thus or thus Expounded, which is to decide Controverſies: Not the Dead Letter, but the true ſenſe of it, delivers the Sentence of the Holy Ghoſt. The Text, as Expounded by private Judgments, is not to be held Gods undoubted Word; unleſs we firſt know the Interpretation thereof to be indeed true, and agreeing wholly to the mind of the Holy Ghoſt; which to know is a thing wholly impoſſible without a Revelation; and yet, untill we come to know this, *we* ſhall neither have Reaſon to agree in one inward Faith interiourly, nor in one outward Profeſſion exteriourly; But ſtill our Hearts and Lips will be devided. This *we* ſee as clearly as Noon-Day-Light, happen among thoſe who take Scripture only for their Judge; which all Hereticks did ever uſe, and will ever uſe to do ſo, to eſcape being condemned or caſt by any other Judgement-Seat. Hence they all ſtill appeal to Scripture; for then they know before hand all that can be ſaid, and know alſo by what Interpretations to ſhew, all that can be brought out of Scripture againſt them, not to be ſpoken by God in any ſenſe contrary to the Opinion they hold. And thus contrary Opinions, grounded in contrary Interpretations, are held, and will be held untill the Worlds end; if there are no other Judge to end them, but the Sentence given by God in the Text of Scripture; not as the Text ſounds, but as the Interpreter Expounds. Here with all poſſible care I would have you note, that all the Faith which our Adverſaries have, relying on their In-

terpretations, which are fallible, can be but fallible and Humane: For they believe, all that they believe, becauſe they fully perſwade themſelves, that, God ſaies that the thing in the Scripture taken not meerly as the Words ſound, but taken as they verily apprehend and Judge the true Interpretation to be ſo, or ſo. This is the ground of their belief in all points; and therefore this is fundamental to their Religion; and that as properly as any thing can be called Fundamental to any Religion: For it is the Foundation it ſelf on which every ſingle point of their belief. and their whole belief in general is ſo wholly Built, that they reſt upon nothing but this. Where firſt I obſerve, that you and we muſt needs differ in the moſt Fundamental point which concerns Religion: For we believe nothing at all, becauſe, by our private Judgement only, we Judge it to be the truly Interpreted ſenſe of Scripture; but becauſe we know it Interpreted ſo by the Church, aſſiſted by the Holy Ghoſt in all her publick Interpretations. You will believe no one point (for Example, that there is a Trinity,) for this Reaſon only; becauſe forſooth you hold the Church fallible in her publick Interpretations of Gods Word: And we will not believe any point of our Faith (for Example, the Trinity) upon that ground; becauſe we know aſſuredly that our own Judgements, in our private Interpretations of Scripture, are moſt fallible. Whence it is evident, that in thoſe very points in which we do agree, we Fundamentally diſagree: Becauſe we diſagree in the very Foundation of our belief concerning thoſe points. Now, in point of belief, we muſt mainly attend, not only to the Truth of what we believe; but to the ground upon which we build our belief. For, if we think our ſelves to build our belief ſecurely, upon a Foundation which is deceitful, (as our own Interpretation is, and the Church not:) We ſhall be ſoon lead to believe things which are falſe; as we ſee a World of People do, by relying on the Scripture as Interpreted by their private Judgement. The *Turk* believes that there is a God, becauſe his *Alcoran* (which is the Rule of his Faith) teaches him ſo: Now, becauſe he be-

believes the Truth upon a deceitful Foundation; he, upon the ſame Foundation, builds the belief of a thouſand falſities. Add to this, that this Judgment of the Interpreter (who according to you is every private Man, yea every private Woman, for his or her own ſelf:) This Judgment, I ſay, is moſt weak, and many points of Faith are matters very hard to conceive, and unfold; and Controverſies alſo are exceedingly intangled; and the conferring Texts with Texts, like and unlike, rather increaſes uncertainty of hitting Right, then it helps to any full aſſured certainty: What then more ſure, then a moſt unaſſured proceeding, in this Interpreter? Again, private Judgments being almoſt as various as private Faces (yea often differing from themſelves,) infinite Variety of Interpretations muſt needs proceed from infinite private Mens Judgments, ſo very various. You may ſee this in your Patriarch *Luther*; who, in matters of higheſt moment, is noted no leſs then *fourſcore times* to have taught flat Contradictions: As you may ſee ſhewed in the end of the firſt *Tome* of our Learned *Coccius*. Not only your *Martin Luther* thus contradicted himſelf in Words; but alſo your *Martin Bucer* contradicted himſelf in exterior change from Religion to Religion: At one time *He fully Judged* thoſe Texts of the Scripture, which ſpeak of the Sacrament of the Body of our Lord, to be truely Interpreted by the *Roman Catholicks;* and ſo he believed CHRIST's Body to be really preſent, and to be adored in the Sacrament. *After this he Judged moſt ſincerely*, that the *Lutherans* did truely Interpret thoſe Texts; and ſo he became a *Lutheran*, holding the real preſence, but denying Chriſts Body to be there Adored. *Thirdly, after this he moſt ſincerely Judged* the Interpretation of thoſe Texts given by *Zuinglians*, to be the only true ſenſe of the Holy Ghoſt; and then he became a *Zuinglian*, denying Chriſts Body to be really preſent in the Sacrament; for which *Luther* termed him *Perfidious*: *Fourthly, he once more ſincerely Judged Luthers* Interpretation of thoſe Texts to be the truer ſenſe of the Holy Ghoſt, and once more became a *Lutheran:* And

therefore in his firſt Edition of his Commentaries upon the ſixth of St. *John* and 26. of St. *Matthew*, He *asketh Pardon of God and the Church for having bewitched many with the Hereſie of* Zuinglius. *Fifthly, yet after this he ſincerely Judged again Zuinglius* his Interpretation of thoſe Texts to be the only true one: And this Interpretation he did publickly profeſs and defend *at Cambridge;* to which Univerſity he was called out of *Germany* as a prime Doctor, to help us here in *England* in our New begun Reformation. And it is to be noted, that, at every one of theſe his changes, he ſtill uſed *moſt earneſt Proteſtations of undoubted certainty, conceived from the Scriptures:* As you may ſee in the moſt Learned *Brierly* in his *Treatiſe* of St. Auſtins *Religion in the Preface;* where he cites his Authors for all theſe changes. To which I add that after all thoſe changes, he is at laſt affirmed to have Died a *Jew*, by Poſſevin *in notis Verbi Dei*, and *Vlenbergius Cauſa* 12. And indeed for one, who hath firſt believed Scripture as Interpreted by every Mans private Judgment, to be to every Man the only ground of all he is to believe concerning Chriſt, and his Doctrine: And then hath conſidered after this, how groundleſs a ground this is; and how, if this be the only means left by Chriſt for Unity in his Church, his Church is moſt pittifully provided: For in this moſt highly important point, it cannot but breed a ſtrong Temptation, to fall quite out of love with *Chriſt* and his Religion, in thoſe who will not admit any thought of ſeeking for a better ground amongſt us, where it might be ſo eaſily found.

4. Queſtionleſs if *Chriſt* be God as he is; and if he truely loves theſe Souls for which he Died; he would not have failed, to provide them of ſome more aſſured means; to know that true Faith without which he will not Save them; then this means is, of leaving them to the Bible as Interpreted by each one as he thinks righteſt. What Law-maker in any Common-Wealth was ever yet found any where ſo imprudent as only to leave the People of his Common-Wealth ſo miſerably provided (for the final

final ending all their Controverſies) as they ſhould be, if he did only leave them a Law-Book for their ſole and only Judge in all their differences; without any living Judge to expound it with unappealable Authority. Well now the Church of *Chriſt* is a Community, which was to be ſpread over the whole Face of the Earth; and intended to laſt untill the Conſumation of the World: And therefore this Community, above all others, had the greateſt need of a moſt ſuper abundantly ſufficient means to end all their Controverſies; which do not concern their Temporal, but Eternal Welfare. A World of Controverſies muſt needs be ſtill riſing in a Community concetning ſo many ſorts of People, and thoſe ſtill further and further removed from *Chriſts* time untill the very end of the World Wherefore this Community had been moſt miſerably and pittifully provided for, in point of Unity in Faith; and *Chriſt* ſhould have gathered together a moſt Heart diſunited ſort of People, if in all their numberleſs differences, after all their reading of Scriptures, confering of places and ſuch like Rules as you preſcribe; they ſhould have no other means left them to end thoſe Controverſies, but the Written Text of the Bible, to be expounded according as they can gueſs at the intent of the Holy Ghoſt. True Faith conſiſts in the interiour Judgment; if then *Chriſt* deſired they ſhould be of one Faith, he deſired alſo they ſhould be of one interiour Judgment: But how could the Wiſdom of God expect this Unity in the inward Judgment, knowing ſo well that every one of theſe Judgments were ſo exceedingly different in framing ſeveral Judments; and that even after they have uſed all the Rules which you give them.

5. By this diſcourſe, without going further, thou mayeſt once more ſee the ungroundedneſs of all thy whole belief, relying only upon the Word of God: As this Word is expounded and underſtood by thy Judgement; which in far eaſier matters hath deceived thee a thouſand times, and may do ſo in this hard matter, in which a World of better under ſtandings then thine do vaſtly differ from thee. If thou do anſwer, that thou re-

lyeſt

lye ſtnot on thy Judgement, But on the Word of God. I ask, whether thou doeſt rely on the Word of God juſt as the letter ſounds? Thou muſt ſay, no. How then? Thou muſt needs ſay, that thou doeſt rely upon it, as it is expounded by thy own Judgement. This alſo appears by the infinite contrariety of Expoſitions and Interpretations given by ſo many relying (juſt as thou doeſt) upon the Word of God: In ſo much that there be no fewer then *two hundred* ſeveral Interpretations of theſe four Words; *This is my Body*: Which Interpretations, altho' they are not all allowed of by thy Religion yet they all of them, proceed from this very ground of thy Religion; of taking the Word of God, not as it ſounds, nor as Expounded by the Church, but as every one in his private Judgment does really think it ought to be Expounded. Wherefore upon the whole matter, it is all one to rely upon a Mans private Judgement: And to rely upon the Scripture, as Interpreted by his own private Judgment. See the vaſt Variety of Religions lately ſprung up by following this Principle, in my firſt *Sect. n.* 23. If thou replyeſt that thou doeſt not truſt to, and rely upon thy Judgement; but upon the Spirit of God, which thou knoweſt aſſured to Rule this Judgement, ſecuring it from all miſunderſtanding of Gods Word: This thy anſwer will have many difficulties. *Firſt*, how canſt thou, without high preſumption aſſume, to thy private ſelf ſo ſecure aſſiſtance of the Spirit (aſſuredly preſerving thee from all Error in thy private Judgment;) when thou doeſt ſo pertinaciouſly deny, that the Church repreſentative it ſelf (when it judgeth in a General Council for the whole World of believers) is aſſured ſo well in their publick Judgement as thou art in thy private? And yet, becauſe thou ſeeſt their Judgment quite contrary to thee, thou muſt fall unto the preſumptuous Paradox. *Secondly*, how comes there to be ſo mighty contrariety in Judgments, among Men confeſſedly guided as ſurely by the Spirit, as thou art? *Thirdly*, no one ſingle Doctor of the primative Church, did ever ſo much as pretend, to

have

have this assurance of the Truth of his Corruption from the Spirit: Canst thou prudently believe thy self to have a greater guift in this kind, then any one of the Holiest Doctors of the Church ever yet had? *Fourthly*, if thou beest not a Prophet, and also if all those of thy Religion be not Prophets (which was not in St. *Pauls* Church as shewed in the last *Sect. n.* 3.) you cannot possibly know with any full assurance, that the Holy Ghost doth assist you: Because nothing, but the Word of God can secure you of this; and it is no where written in the Word of God, that you *A. B.* By your private Judgment, can infallibly Expound all Texts in the Scripture, concerning necessary points. And if you, by your private Interpretation do expound any Text or Texts of Scripture so, as to secure you of this: Yet you are assuredly to know, that you cannot assuredly know this Interpretation of those Texts to be most certainly true: For to know assuredly these Texts to be rightly Expounded by you, you must be assured from some other Text; about the right understanding of which Text there will be still the same difficulty, and the same certain uncertainty; untill, without bringing any Text, you can prove your self certainly to be thus infallibly assisted in your Interpretation. And because you prove this without a Text; we are not to believe you, who teach us, that nothing is to be believed, as infallibly true, which is not written in the Bible: In all which? I am sure, it is not written, that you *A. B.* are a true believer: And therefore, though it were written there, *That all true believers had this assistance of the Spirit*; You were never the nearer. *Fifthly*, how prepostorously ridiculous is it, to hold your self infallible in declaring Gods Word: And yet not to hold the whole Church infallible in declaring or interpreting the same?

6. Wherefore, your last refuge is to say, that all points necessary are clearly set down in Scripture; which I have shewed (and shall further shew) to be manifestly false: And you may even with your Fingars touch the False-Hood of it, in this most ne-

neceſſary point of knowing which is the certain undoubted true ſenſe of Scripture. For, in things which are clearly to be ſeen, there uſed not to be Variety (and infinite Variety) of Judgements: As we have ſeen there is, in Interpreting the neceſſary Texts of Scripture: In ſo much as no Divine, by Scripture only, can convince an *Arian Cobler*, as I ſhewed *Sect.* 1. *n.* 5. Altho this *Cobler* holds alſo Scripture for his only Judge. This Variety of Interpretations (one flatly oppoſite to the other) ſhews evidently the Scripture in theſe points not to be evidently clear. Again, if we mark it, this anſwer is very little to the purpoſe, in our Adverſaries Principles: For *firſt*, they teach that our Catholick *Roman* Religion does not differ from theirs in any point Fundamental, or neceſſary to Salvation: *Secondly*, they teach that the Scripture cannot be ſhewed to be clear in points not ſo fully neceſſary for Salvation. Hence I argue thus; in points wholly neceſſary to Salvation you and we all agree; as you ſay: So that by this you can infer no more then that the Scripture is clear in thoſe points in which we both agree. What get you by this? Do you ſeperate from the whole Church for other points, which you cannot prove your ſelves, by this ground, to have clear Scripture for? It is your common Doctrine delivered by Dr. *Ferne* in his *Sect.* 13. that *againſt publick Authority* (eſpecially of all Churches in the whole World, all which you oppoſed in very many important points) *there muſt be brought evident Demonſtration of clear Scripture.* You do not prove that you bring this, unleſs you can prove the Scripture Univerſally to be clear in points not neceſſary to Salvation: For about theſe *(as you ſay)* we only differ. If you pleaſe to ſay then, tho' Scripture be not clear in all points unneceſſary, yet it is clear in thoſe in which we now diſagree; every Child will ſee, that you Begg that very thing which is in Queſtion. And what Argument will you bring, to make us believe that the beſt and the choiſeſt Doctors that were in any Church, for theſe laſt Thouſand and two or three hundred Years, could not ſee the true ſenſe of a clear, plain, and evident Text of Scripture,

which

which they read every day? And yet you muſt encreaſe the Miracle, and ſay; that all thoſe Doctors of that Age in which firſt the true Religion decayed, muſt needs know, that the whole former Church, from Chriſts dayes to their dayes, had underſtood thoſe clear places juſt as you underſtand them now; that is in their true ſenſe. Now, I pray, upon what record have you it related, that there did fall in the fourth, or fifth, or ſixth Age, ſuch a thick miſt upon all the beſt ſeeing Eyes of that unhappy Age, (about which Age alſo none of you can agree;) that no one Doctor could, or would ſee himſelf to proceed againſt the known ſenſe of all former Chriſtianity, in the Interpretation of thoſe Texts, which ſo evidently ſtand for the Doctrine of all former Chriſtianity againſt them? Will you have us to believe this ſtrangeſt Wonder of all Wonders, without any Record from Antiquity; only upon your ſaying that it was ſo.

7. There is yet an other convincing Reaſon, why this clearneſs you ſpeak of in Scriptures, to unfold unto us the undoubted ſenſe of the Holy Ghoſt in all neceſſary Controverſies, comes to be of no ſervice, for the infallible finding out the true ſenſe by every private Man and Woman: To all which you uſe ſtill to ſay; *If you will be with us, you ſhall ſee what you do; We require your Obedience to what we Demonſtrate to be Gods will for you to believe and do*, as D. *Ferne* boaſts *Sect.* 14. Here we come to the point to ſee your Demonſtration: If you gull us here you undo us: Make us then ſee, that by clear Demonſtration of Scripture, we may ſee what God in all neceſſary points requires of us to believe and to do: And make all of us Men, and Women, do this. How vaſtly you deceive us, I have ſhewed already, *Sect.* 2. *n.* 13. which place I muſt needs intreat the Reader to turn to, and Read attentively, before he goeth further. There we have ſhewed (and that by D. *Fernes* own Confeſſion in his *Sect.* 26.) that all things neceſſary are not contained expreſly in Scripture: But ſome of them are only thence deducible. But tell me *(Great Doctor)* be they de-

ducible by all of us, whom you promiſe ſo glorioufly to make Eye-witneſſes of this Demonſtration? *They be* (ſaies he) *deducible not all by every one that Reads; but it is enough if done by the Paſtors and Guides which God appointed in his Church to this purpoſe.* What? did you call us all to be Blind-folded by you, and not to ſee the Demonſtration: But to hear only this News of it; that it has been ſeen to be a Demonſtrable deduction by your Miniſters? We do not ſee your Demonſtration, but your groſs Cheat. Yet (*my dear Brother*) thou ſhalt ſee thy ſelf gulled far more. Every Miniſter hath not Eyes (how wilt thou know whether thy Miniſter hath, or no?) to ſee this Demonſtrative deduction: For *Dr. Ferne* adds, *That they muſt be Miniſters uſing the means that are needful* (mark the Word *needful*) *for that purpoſe; ſuch as is,* 1. *Attention.* 2. *Diligence in the ſearch of the Scripture.* 3. *Collation of places.* 4. *Obſerving the Connexions.* 5. *Alſo ſincerity and impartiality in the collection or deduction they make.* 6. *Alſo Prayer and Devotion for aſſiſtance in the Work.* Alſo, beſides theſe ſix Rules, there be fourteen more to be added; as I ſhewed in the place above cited: Of which ſome be as impoſſible for the vulgar multitude to uſe (tho this multitude make up the number of the Believers) as it is for them to be cunning in Greek and Hebrew; for they (to know they have Interpreted the Scripture right) muſt of neceſſity be cunning in both theſe Languages. Neither do I ſay any more in this, then your own moſt learned Doctors have ſaid before me; to which I add your moſt Learned *Whitaker*, *lib. de Sacra Scrip. p.* 5. 23. where he ſaies of thoſe who underſtand not the Hebrew and Greek; that *they do often Err, and that unvoidably: Sæpe ac neceſſario hallucinantur.* Now bid us Poor People, *Come with you, and we ſhall ſee what we do.* Now indeed we ſee what we do; for we clearly ſee we do we know not what; becauſe we ſee we leave by your Inſtruction, the Interpretations of all Councels, and Fathers, ſeconded by the perpetual practice of all Churches, which God had upon the Face of the Earth,

for

for twelve hundred Years together, as is confeſſed: And this we do to follow, not this evidence which we are told we ſhould ſee with our own Eyes to be ſuch; but to follow what ſome Miniſters ſay they ſee to be evident, to wit, thoſe few Miniſters, who are perfectly skilled in Greek and Hebrew; of whoſe perfect skill we have no knowledge of our own; and tho' we had, we do not perfectly know that they have uſed, in all points they teach us, theſe twenty Rules which they confeſs to be *needful:* And we alſo do know that all theſe twenty Rules are confeſſed to be fallible; and we have little hope by twenty fallible means, to come to ſee an infallible Truth eſtabliſhed; for when we were Boys at School, learning a little Arithmetick, we were taught, that *naught times naught did make nothing but naught.*

Mille licet Cyphris Cyphrarum millia jungas,
Nil præter Magnum conficies Nihilum.
To Nothing joyn ten thouſand Nothings more:
Thou ſhalt find Nothing but of Nothings ſtore.

Add not only twenty, but twenty thouſand fallible Rules: You ſhall be never the nearer that infallible Truth, by being ſo well provided of fallibilities.

8. I have (I hope) ſhewed thee ſufficiently, that thou canſt not ſee aſſuredly, and upon thy own knowledge know evidently, which is the true ſenſe of the Scripture. Now I will give thee a further Reaſon thereof, delivered by one of thy own chief Doctors, *Doctor Jeremy Taylor in his diſcourſe of the Liberty of Prophecying, Sect.* 3. where he proves the uncertainty of Arguments deduced (as *Dr. Ferne* ſpeaks) from Scripture, by the many ſenſes of Scripture; when the Grammatical ſenſe is found out. For *there is in very many Scriptures a double ſenſe, a Literal and a Spiritual; and both theſe ſenſes are ſubdivided: For the Literal ſenſe is either Natural, or Figurative; and the Spiritual ſometimes Allegorical, ſometimes Tropological; ſometimes there are divers Literal ſenſes in the*

ſame places: So he. Now it depends upon the ſecret Intention of the Holy Ghoſt, to have uſed theſe Words in ſome one, or two or more of theſe ſenſes. How ſhall we find out ſo great a ſecret, and that ſo infallibly, as to be undoubtedly aſſured, of our own knowledge, that we have certainly diſcovered this ſecret? Twenty fallible Rules, tho' we ſhould uſe them all, as well as a Man could, would not bring us to this infallible aſſurance. Even your great Doctors *(who have uſed them better then thou canſt hope to do)* have had *two hundred ſeveral Opinions* about the true ſenſe of theſe four Words, *This is my Body.* Thou thinkeſt thy ſelf to be aſſured infallibly upon thy own knowledge, that theſe Words be to be Interpreted Figuratively; becauſe thou haſt conferred this Text with ſome other Texts, for Example with thoſe Texts which tell thee that *Chriſts* Words *be Spirit and Life*, and that *The Fleſh profiteth nothing.* Alas! thou haſt obſerved but one of theſe Twenty Rules which is Conference of one Text with another: This Rule is infinitely deceitful, as the ſame Doctor *Taylor* teaches thee, who in his next Section ſaies; *Another great pretence (* to juſtifie *new* Interpretations *) is the Conference of places; A thing of ſuch indefinite Capacity, that, if there be Ambiguity of Words, Variety of Senſes, Alteration of Circumſtances, or difference of ſtile amongſt Divine Writers, there is nothing which may be more abuſed by wilful People, or may more eaſily deceive the unwary, or that may amuſe the moſt intelligent obſervers.* What ſhall then become of thee and me who are none of the moſt intelligent obſervers? And ſo this Rule alone leaveth us at a *non plus*, even tho' we had both *Greek* and *Hebrew.* For (as the ſame Doctor intimates) it is a moſt pittiful Argument to infer; *this muſt infallibly be the true ſenſe*, becauſe I can ſhew that *perhaps it may be the true ſenſe.* Again, when your Doctors bid me Confer this Text with other Text of the Bible: I ask, whether I muſt confer it only with other places of the ſame Book in which it is Written? They will ſay, no; but I moſt confer it with all other Texts of the Word of God,

Written in any Book. *First*, this is a vaſt Labour, and requires a vaſt Memory to do it, as it ſhould be done, with exquiſite Attention. *Secondly*, I have a Queſtion to ask, which I am ſure will poſe you: How ſhall I, or any Doctor of them all, confer this Text with the Texts of all other Books of Scripture, ſeeing that no fewer then ſome *twenty* Books of Scripture have quite periſhed, and be no where to be found in the whole World? As I ſhewed *Sect.* 1. *n.* 7. *Thirdly*, You ſay that by this confering of Places, *what was* obſcure proved clear: And you mark not, that by the very ſame means, *what was* clear groweth obſcure. What more clear then what St. *Paul* ſaid; *If you be Circumciſed*, Chriſt *will profit you nothing*, *Gal.* 5. Take this ſo clear a Text, and confer it with that, *Act.* 16. 3. *He took* Timothie, *and Circumciſed him*; and you will find difficulty how the former Text can ſtand in full force. Do you think St. *Paul* would make CHRIST profit *Timothie* nothing.

9. Hence I infer, that if God had intended the Scripture for our ſole and only rule of Faith, he would have ſet down in ſome one place all neceſſary points clearly, and diſtinctly; and he would not have left theſe points to be picked out, one out of one Book, and an other out of an other, no Man directly knows where: Yea no Man knows by Scripture, which points are neceſſary even for himſelf or for all. Had God intended to make a Book our only Judge or Rule, he would have given us ſuch a Book as ſhould clearly and diſtinctly have ſaid; *theſe points are neceſſary to be believed*, *theſe things are neceſſary to be done.* But now, one Man tells us one thing is neceſſary, an other man ſayes no: The Scripture ſayes neither Yea nor No. Therefore, to thoſe who will follow Scripture only, no aſſurance at all can be had of the neceſſity of ſuch points as the Scripture doth not affirm to be neceſſary: For if you have only Human reaſon for this neceſſity, this is but a Human motive, which is deceitful; and being thwarted with a contrary reaſon

of

of as apparent probability, my Faith now is turned into a doubt. The points which are neceſſary, you commonly ſay to be but few; and that the Scripture ſets them down clearly, as it doth alſo ſet down clearly many other points not neceſſary. Whence the vaſt number of thoſe not-neceſſary points clearly ſet down doth infinitly increaſe the difficulty of finding out theſe few which are neceſſary: Seeing that they lie ſo ſcattered and intermingled in the numberleſs number of the not-neceſſary. For ſome of theſe neceſſary points are ſet down here, in the begining of the Bible; ſome one, ſome two or three Books after; ſome other hard by that, ſome other a huge way of; and ſo from *Gen.* to the *Apoc.* Yea, why not further then the *Apoc.* For it is a meer gueſs made at random, to conjecture that in thoſe twenty Books of Scripture, which be quite loſt, no one neceſſary point ſhould be ſet down plainly, which is not ſet down plainly in theſe Books which we have. At leaſt you ſay this without Scripture; and therefore, by your own principles, you ſhould not not ſay it: For your part being affirmative, (affirming that no one neceſſary point was plainly ſet down in thoſe Books which be loſt, which is not plainly ſet down in theſe which we have;) you muſt prove what you ſay, and that by Scripture: For I am ſure you cannot prove it by Tradition; and therefore neither in your, nor our principles it can be proved. Again; the Bible, as it is now, makes a Book ſo bigg, that the far greater part of the World, taken up with ſo many neceſſary affairs, cannot in a very long ſpace of time read over this Book ſo often and ſo exactly carry away all the clear Texts thereof, as to be ableto confer one place with another: For before they come to the other, which is perhaps in the *Apocalyps*, that Text, which they did Read in *Geneſis*, is out of their mind: Or if that Text be not, ſome other may be, even at a time in which they ſhould have moſt obſerved it. Beſides this, what am I the nearer if I ſpend all this labour in my *Engliſh* Tranſlated Bible; of the right Tranſlation of which I neither have

have, nor can have full aſſurance, if I be not a very great Scholler; as hath been ſhewed *Sect.* 5. Yea, tho' I be ſo great that one among one hundred thouſand is not greater; (for I underſtand *Greek* and *Hebrew* moſt skilfully:) Yet, for all this, I neither have, nor can have full aſſurance, that the *Greek* and *Hebrew* Copies which I uſe, be the true Copies of the true Word of God; as hath been ſhewed *Section* 5. Gods wiſdom directs him to the beſt means, to compaſs his Intention: We even in our ordinary Wiſdom, if we intend to ſet forth a Book, which ſhould end all neceſſary Controverſies, would all do our beſt endeavour to compriſe in half a dozen Chapter at the moſt, all theſe few Fundamental points; for theſe points you teach to be but few: And we would not make thoſe Poor Souls (which we dearly loved) at the peril of their own Damnation, to ſeek out, all the whole Bible over, theſe few points which are confeſſed not to be ſo eaſie to be found out, but by ſome choice Miniſters obſerving all that long way, which is from the firſt of *Geneſis* to the very laſt Verſe of the Apocalips, no fewer then twenty Rules, and many of them very hard ones to obſerve at all times, in all paſſages of ſo long a Journey. And yet there is to the full, as great Reaſon, why thoſe twenty Books more, which are loſt; as all theſe which we now have, ſhould be conſulted: Being God gave us all the whole Written Word for our Guide. God did not proceed thus even in the Old Law in points of far, and incomparable far leſs concernment; to wit in points of meer Ceremony: For every little particular Ceremony which he exacted is, with moſt minute exactneſs ſet down in the compaſs of not many Leafs: Yet far fewer would contain all points neceſſary to Salvation, if they be ſo few as you hold.

10. We then, by our own Judgement, are notable to deduce Demonſtratively all thoſe Truths and Verities, which are wholly neceſſary to our Salvation: But inſtead of doing this by our own ſelves, and upon our own knowledge, with de-

demonſtrative ſecurity; we are in plain terms told by the beſt *Proteſtant* Doctors, that this cannot be done by us even in all theſe neceſſary points; no nor done by all our Miniſters, without the uſe of many Rules, which the far greater part of them cannot uſe. What then ſhall we do? Which way ſhall we turn our ſelves? Is there no better way, then to truſt thoſe choice, but ſtill fallible Miniſters; uſing ſtill only fallible Rules; and infallibly ſure to contradict one another? I will tell thee firſt what thy own *Proteſtant* prime Maſters in Scripture do plainly tell thee, I mean thoſe Renowned Doctors who now, at this very time, are ſetting forth that ſo famous Bible, of ſo many learned Languages. Theſe Doctors, peruſing Night and Day the beſt Original Copies of the Bible that be to be had, may as ſafely be followed by thee, as any Miniſters thou knoweſt. Theſe Men in the *Preface* to their great Work, which I cited *Sect.* 4. *n.* 8. Having firſt endavoured to clear that Controverſie about the Truth of the Copies of Gods true Word which they give us; they then ſpeak thus: *The whole Controverſie being about the true ſenſe of the Scripture, delivered by Tranſlations every where received, we have ready at Hand the Judgment almoſt of that whole Church which is* Catholick (or Univerſal) *as well in reſpect of its being in all places, as its being in all times; which Church unfolds to us the places in Controverſie. To whoſe Judgment* (mark this) *he who will not ſubmit himſelf, truly he ſhews himſelf to be a Man of no Judgment, and he is ſcarce worth the Name of a Man, much leſs of a Chriſtian.* So they *fol.* 4. This is a different leſſon from what *Dr. Ferne* taught thee. But it hath better Authority, Catholick Antiquity being altogether of one mind in this point. I will tell thee this out of a moſt approved Doctor of the Primitive Church, and no Man does ſo much as Queſtion whether the Words which I ſhall cite out of him be his, or no; He has but one little Book in all; It is *Vincentius Lerinenſis*, who lived in the fifth Age; he Writes thus: *Do Hereticks uſe the Teſtimonies of Scripture? Yes indeed do they, and that moſt vehemently; you*

ſhall

ſhall ſee them fly through all the Sacred Book, the Books of Moſes, *the Books of Kings, the Pſalms, the Apoſtles, the Goſpels, the Prophets: And thus whether they be among their own People, or others; both privately and publickly; both in their diſcourſes and in their Books; both in Banckets, and in the Streets: They ſcarce ever ſpeak one Word of their own which they do not ſet forth with the Words of the Scripture. Read but the Works of* Paulus Samozatenus, *of* Priſcillianus, Eunomius, Jovinianus, *and ſuch like peſtiferous Fellows, you ſhall ſee infinite heaps of Examples, and ſcarce one ſide of a Leaf, which is not painted out with Sentences of the New and the Old Teſtament.* And a little after, *when now they ſhall begin not only to bring forth, but alſo to expound, and not only to caſt out, but alſo to Interpret thoſe Words, then prophane Novelties are laid open, then you may ſee the hedges cut down, and thoſe Limits transferred which our Fathers did put us; then you may ſee the Doctrine of the Church torn in pieces, &c.* And by and by: *But ſome one will ſay what ſhall* Catholicks *do, and the Sons of the Church? By what means ſhall they diſtinguiſh the Truth contained in Scriptures from the falſity of their Interpretations? They muſt exceedingly apply their care to Interpret the Divine Canon of Scripture, according to the Traditions of the Univerſal* Church, *and the Rules of the* Catholick *Doctrine: Which practice I ſaid in the begining of this Book was delivered down unto us by Holy and Learned Men.* So he. And the place which he cited out of the begining of his Book, is admirable to our preſent diſcourſe: For having put the very Objection which our Adverſaries uſe to make; *that ſeeing the Canon of Scripture is perfect, and ſuperabundantly ſufficient in all reſpects; what need is there that the Authority of Churches Interpretation ſhould be joyned to it?* then he Anſwers; *Becauſe forſooth all Men do not in one and the ſelf ſame ſenſe, take the ſacred Scripture by reaſon of the great depth thereof. One Man expounds it one way, one Man another way; inſomuch that as many ſenſes may ſeem to be deducible from it,*

as there be Men. For Novatianus *expounds it one way*, Photinus *another*, Donatus *another*, Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius *another*; Apollinaris *and* Priſcillianus, Jovinianus *and* Pelagius *another: Laſtly*, Celeſtius *and* Neſtorius *another. And therefore multum neceſſe eſt, It is very much neceſſary to avoid ſo great and ſo manifold* Labyrinths *of Error, that the Line, by which we rule out the Interpretation of the Prophets and Apoſtles, be directed according to the Rules of the* Church *and the* Catholick *ſenſe.* So he: So I; ſay thou alſo ſo; and all our Diviſions will be ended: For then we ſhould not, under pretence of ſeeing with our own Eyes what we do, take the Scripture contrary to ſo many Councils, and all Authority of Church-Tradition; becauſe we Judge it ought to be Expounded ſo in our private Judgement, tho' differing from all Churches upon the Face of the Earth. But I muſt have a Church, upon whoſe Authority we all ſecurely may and alſo muſt relie, in Interpreting the Scriptures, as St. *Vincent* ſpeaks; and that Church, muſt of neceſſity be granted to be infallible: But no Church can be infallible which has not this Condition, that it holds and teaches it ſelf to be infallible; as I ſhall Demonſtrate *Sect.* 17. *n.* 2. which Condition agreeing to no one Church but the *Roman (as is manifeſt;)* this Holy Father, and all the reſt *(who bid us ſtill in doubts and* Controverſies *about the* Scriptures *and their ſeveral Interpretations rely upon the* Church, *and take Her Doctrine for our Warrant)* do bid us relie upon that Church which was held, and truly held by all to be infallible. And ſo all very well know that they meant the *Roman* Church, and no Church differing in Communion from Her; becauſe this Condition agreed to none but Her. When this was ſo undiſputably out of all Queſtion, among all ſuch as were then counted Catholicks, then they thought it enough to ſay; *Rely on the Church:* Without ſaying, *Rely on the* Roman *Church.* So we Catholicks ſpeak to this very day, never adding the *Roman*, but for our Adverſaries ſake among whom we live: Juſt as *Engliſh*-Men ſay, *The Parliament decided ſuch a thing;* meaning

ing the *Parliament of England:* Which all *Engliſh* in *England* perfectly underſtand without adding any other Words: But the *Engliſh* (who live among *French*-men) when in *France* they ſay, *The Parliament Decreed ſuch a thing;* they muſt of neceſſity add, *the Parliament of England*, to be rightly underſtood of the *French*-Men there; who otherwiſe might think they meant ſome *French Parliaments.* Thoſe who have made themſelves of a different Communion from *Rome*, will not now in theſe dayes underſtand that pure Old Catholick Language ſtill common to all us of the *Roman* Communion: *The Church Decreed this; follow the Interpretation of the Church; rely on the Interpretation of the Church, &c.* When we expreſs our ſelves thus by this Word *Church*, without adding the Word *Roman;* we are known by all who be of the true Church, only to mean the *Roman* Church, and thoſe of Her Communion: Yet even we in theſe ſtrange *New* times to be underſtood by theſe Out-landiſh *(as I may ſay)* and *New-found* People of our daies, muſt needs add the Word *Roman;* or elſe they will not underſtand us to ſpeak of that Church, of which we are by all our own Church moſt perfectly underſtood to ſpeak. And Antiquity by the Name of *the Church* ſtill meant *the Roman Church;* juſt as we do: And juſt as *we* ſpeak among our ſelves, ſo then ſpoke *the Holy* grave Fathers, whoſe Catholick Language was nothing underſtood by that Forreigner, who more boldly then adviſedly, ſaid *that none of the Ancient Chriſtians believed the* Church of Rome *to be a Guide or Judge of all Controverſies in Chriſtianity, becauſe* Tertullian, Vincentius Lerinenſis, *and others giving Rules to know Hereticks, forgot this main and cleareſt Rule:* Whereas you ſee by the Words I have cited, that *Vicentius Lerinenſis* tells you as clearly as I do, that to avoid Hereſie you muſt in underſtanding the Scripture, follow the Interpretation *of the Church*, as a ſecure Guide and Interpreter in all Controverſies ariſing about the ſenſe of Scriptures; ſhewing it a note of Hereſie to do the contrary. The very ſelf ſame is told you by all thoſe Fathers whom I ſhall

cite, *Sect.* 21. *Num.* 2. 3. 4. There is then no more Myſtery in ſaying that thoſe Ancient Fathers, being members of the *Roman* Church, did by the Name of the Church, mean that *Roman Church*, of which they were Members, tho' they added not the Name of *Roman:* Then there is in the ordinary ſpeech of every Man in *England*, when, by the Name of *the Parliament*, he means only to ſignifie the *Engliſh Parliament;* tho' he adds not the Word *Engliſh:* And yet that acute *Univerſity Man* will not underſtand this ſo Vulgar Language.

SECTION VIII.

A TWELFTH ARGUMENT.

Divers other neceſſary points not contained in, or decided by Scripture.

1. TO the former nineteen points all neceſſary, and none of them all contained in Scripture; I will add diverſe more. The Creed of St. *Athanaſius* hath ever been admitted by all ſucceeding true believers, and your *Engliſh* Church does profeſs to believe it, and uſed to Read it in their *Common Prayer.* In this Creed you profeſs your ſelves to believe ſeveral points no where contained in the Bible in plain terms: *As that God the Father is not begotten;* that *God the Son is not made, but begotten by his Father only:* That *the Holy Ghoſt is neither made nor begotten; but doth proceed, and that from the Father and the Son.* And that *he who will be ſaved, muſt believe this.* For this is an Article of that Catholick Faith, *which Faith without a Man holds entirely and inviolably, without all doubt he ſhall periſh Eternally.* All this is in that Creed profeſſed by us; and yet not one of thoſe ſeveral points con-

contained in it, can be ſhewed to be contained in Scripture, no not for the Subſtance of them in any ſuch Texts as clearly decide the matter. Note by the way, how you plainly contradict your ſelves, who ſubſcribe to the truth of all that hath been ſaid of the neceſſity that there is to Salvation, to believe all the foreſaid particulars here expreſſed by St. *Athanaſius:* And yet you will needs hold the Greek Church for a true Church, which holds flatly againſt St. *Athanaſius* in this Article; tho' *the holding of it entirely* be neceſſary to Salvation.

2. To this point (for I let all theſe ſeveral points paſs for only one) I might add, that in the ſame Book of *Common-Prayer* you in another Creed believe, that *Chriſt is of one Subſtance with the Father;* and that *the Holy Ghoſt proceeds from the Father and the Son:* For which Words the Grecian Church holds us all Hereticks; and yet your Doctors of the *Engliſh* Church will needs hold them a true Church. But that which I preſs is, that we are bound to give an infallible aſcent to this Article *of God the Sons being of one Subſtance with the Father:* But you, who will give no infallible aſcent to any thing but Gods Written Word, cannot poſſibly give infallible aſcent to this Article; Which is no where clearly ſet down in Scripture, but an *Arian Cobler* will eaſily put off all the Texts you can bring; as I ſhewed, S. 1. *n.* 5. But not to ſtand conteſting about the clearneſs of theſe Texts, let this point paſs joyned to the former.

3. For another point not contained in Scripture, I bring the *Baptiſm of Children;* which is wholly neceſſary to the Salvation of Children. The Learned *Layman* ſaies *L.* 5. *Tra.* 2 *c.* 6. *num.* 11. That it has been by ſome obſerved that *the third part of Mankind Dyeth before the ſeventh year of their age be ended.* The third part then of Mankind is concerned in this one point, of giving Lawfull Baptiſm to them when they are Children: And yet, a point ſo neceſſary to the Salvation of many is no where plainly ſet down in Scripture. To This *D. Ferne* anſwers, *S.* 24. *Baptiſm*

*of Children, as to the practiſe of it, is not contained expreſly in Scripture; (*id eſt*) it is no where commanded to be done, or ſaid that they did do it: But the ground and neceſſity of it are ſufficiently delivered in Scripture; and that is enough for the doing of it. And that the Arguments from Scripture, by* Bellarmine *and others alledged, do ſufficiently ſhew* Furthermore concerning *Bellarmine*, the Doctor tells us, that he (*Lib. de Baptiſmo c.* 8.) ſaies *that the Arguments for Childrens Baptiſm out of Scripture cannot be avoided; and that it is a thing evident in Scripture.* But yet (ſaies D. *Ferne*) when he treats of Traditions (*L.* 4. *de Verbo Dei Cap.* 4.) *This thing of Childrens Baptiſm muſt be one of them, that is neceſſary and not contained in Scripture. This is not ingenuous, nor Conſcionable.* So D. *Ferne*; but far leſs Conſcionably: For *Bellarmine L.* 7. *de Bapt.* In all that eight Chapter has no Word in favour of the evidence of Scripture for Baptiſm of Children; Yea, almoſt at every Text that he cites, he ſhews, that Text to have no force out of our Adverſaries Mouth. Of one Argument out of Scripture he ſaith indeed; that, as it comes from us; (which Words *D. Ferne* conceals) it is ſo manifeſt that it cannot be avoided; and that is, that Circumciſion was ſo clear a Figure of Baptiſm, that St. *Paul* called it Circumciſion; But Circumciſion was given to Infants, therefore Baptiſm may. But here *Bellarmine* may well mean that this Argument, as it comes from us cannot be eluded; to wit, by that uſual ſhift, by which the *Anabaptiſts* can eaſely elude it when it comes from *Lutherians* and *Calviniſts*: Whom *Bellarmine* had ſhewed to teach that the Form of Baptiſm was only a Sermon; which agrees not to Infants: This evaſion cannot any way elude this Argument as it comes from us. This is all can be convinced out of this place of *Bellarmine*. But there be other ſolid wayes of avoiding all force of this Argument, even as it comes from us. For firſt, every Sacrament muſt not be received by all thoſe, by whom the Figure of that Sacrament might Lawfully be taken; Sinners did Lawful-

fully Eat *Manna*, but they cannot Lawfully receive the *Euchariſt*; of which *Manna* was a Figure: So alſo Circumciſion was neceſſary for the Male-Children of the *Jews* only, and that not before the eight day; and Baptiſm is now neceſſary both for the Male and Female Children of all Nations in the World, and that before either the eight, or ſecond day, if there be danger of Death: The conſequence then holds not from the Figure to the thing Figured. Neither is that a neceſſary conſequence which is drawn from Baptizing of whole Families. For firſt, as we read that whole Families were Baptized, ſo we read that whole Families Believed. *Himſelf Believed and his whole Family. Jo.* 4. *v.* 53. Will you evidently infer from hence, that the little Children, not yet of Years of Diſcretion, did believe? They then only believed who were Capable: So will *Anabaptiſts* ſay, they only were Baptized in theſe Families who were Capable of firſt believing, and anſwering for themſelves. *Secondly*, in many Families all the Children which are alive, are above ſeven Years Old, and of Age to believe: There be many Families of new Married People, who as yet have no Children; or thoſe they had, be Dead: Many are Barren, and will never have any. Now *Mr. Doctor* as theſe two chief places (brought by *Belarmine*, or others) do afford you no clear Principle, from which you can evidently deduce the neceſſity of Infants Baptiſm; or that it is good and valid, and not to be iterated; or that their Parents are obliged to procure it for their little Children: So other leſs ſtrong places will leſs help you to the evident inference of any of theſe points, which you hold neceſſarily to be believed. I am not ſatisfied by being told, other Men cite Texts which do prove this evidently: You muſt cite them, and ſhew them to be evident. The beſt Text, beſides theſe, is this, *Except a man be born of Water and the Spirit; he cannot enter into Kingdom of Heaven*, Jo. 3. 5. But how many ſhifts the *Anabaptiſts* have to avoid the force of this Text, *Bellarmine* tells you; and you ſhall ſee one preſently.

4. Much

4. Much more ingenuous and Conſcionable is your D. *Taylor* in his Defence of Epiſcopacy. *S.* 9. *P.* 100. where he ſayth; *Baptiſm of Infants is of ordinary neceſſity to all that ever cryed; and yet the Church hath founded this Rite upon the Tradition of the Apoſtles. And Wiſe Men do eaſily obſerve, that the* Anabaptiſts *can, by the ſame probability of Scripture enforce a neceſſity of Comunicating Infants, upon us; as we do of Baptizing, upon them.* For as we preſs them with that Text; *Except a man be born of Water and the Spirit; he cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven:* So they preſs us for the neceſſity of Infants Communion, by the Text which follows but three Chapters after the former: *Verily Verily, I ſay unto you, except you Eat of the Fleſh of the Son of Man, and Drink his Blood, you have no Life in you.* D. *Taylor* adds; *and therefore a great Maſter of* Geneva, *in a Book he writ againſt the* Anabaptiſts, *was forced to fly Apoſtolical traditive ordination.* Here is the very thing ingenuouſly confeſſed which we labour to prove; that we muſt truſt the Churches Tradition for this points: The neceſſity of which is ſo great, that he adds; *They that deny this are, by the juſt* Anathema *of the Catholick Church, confidently condemned for Hereticks.* The *Pelagians* were ever accounted Heretiks, even in this reſpect that they (as St. *Auſten* witneſſes Hereſie, 88.) taught; *Altho' Infants be not Baptized, they ſhall poſſeſs an Eternal and Bleſſed Life; tho' it be out of the Kingdom of God.* Thoſe *Proteſtants* are far bolder, who admit them even into the Kingdom of Heaven it ſelf. The Doctrine of the Ancient Fathers is ſo manifeſtly againſt this Doctrine, that *Calvin* himſelf ſaies; (*Inſtit. lib* 4. *c.* 15. *n.* 20. *It was uſual many Ages ſince, even almoſt from the begining of the Church, that in danger of Death, Lay People might Baptize.* So he. *And to ſay the contrary were to croſs all Antiquity;* as your *Bilſon* confeſſes in his Conference at *Hampton* Court. *Hooker* ſaies no leſs in his 5. Book of *Eccl. Policy* 62. For, as your *Muſculus* confeſſes; *The Fathers*

denyed

denied Salvation to the Children who Died without Baptiſm; *tho' their Parents were* Faithful, So he *in Locis tit. de* Baptiſm.

5. To theſe, I might add the *Milevetan* Council; in which St. *Auſten* was preſent and Subſcribed, and in which (*Can.* 2) it is defined; *That whoſoever denies Children newly born to be Baptized, or ſay they contract nothing of Sin from* Adam, *which may be cleanſed by the Laver of Regeneration: Anathema.* But that which I chiefly inſiſt on, is that the Fathers profeſs to believe the neceſſity of Baptiſm for Infants upon Tradition. So that here D. *Ferne* will ſee a point neceſſary to Salvation to come down to us by unwritten Tradition: Which he ſtifly denies, *Sect.* 24. *Origen* who lived juſt upon the ſecond Age (*which Age knew beſt the Tradition of the firſt Age*) writes thus *cap.* 6. *Epiſtola ad Romanos. The Church from the Apoſtles hath received the Tradition to give* Baptiſm *even to little ones.* And the great St *Auſten* is Witneſs of the Continuance of this Tradition in his Age; as alſo that this point ought not to be believed at all, but upon Tradition: (Note his Words Mr. *Doctor*, they are theſe;) *The cuſtome of our Mother the* Church, *in* Baptizing *little ones, is not to be contemned: Neither is it by any means to be reputed ſuperfluous: Neither ought it to be believed at all, without it were an Apoſtolical Tradition. lib.* 10. *de Gen. ad lit. c.* 22. Note that he eſteems the belief of this neceſſity, to be ſo weakly grounded in Scripture, that it *ought not at all to be believed without it came down to us by Tradition.* And again (*contra Greſcon. lib.* 1. *c.* 33. ſpeaking of this point, he ſaies; *That nothing for certain can be alledged out of* Canonical Scriptures *in this point; Yet in this point, the truth of Scriptures* (and conſequently a ſufficient ground for Faith) *is kept by us, when we do* that *which ſeemed good to the* Catholick Church; *which* Church *the Authority of the ſame* Scriptures *does commend.* Now join this place to theſe places which I have alledged in the laſt *Sect. n.* 1. to ſhew that the Scripture did bid us ſtill follow the Church: And you will ſee

manifeſtly that we may, and in this point, muſt ground our Faith upon what we have only from the Church; or elſe we can have no Faith at all of this neceſſity of Baptiſm, as our Adverſaries have none at all of it: For Scripture they have not, and the Tradition of the Church they hold no ſufficient ground of Faith; which St. *Auſten* in this neceſſary point takes for the chief ground of his Faith; and again (*lib.* 4. *c.* 24. *adverſus Don. de Baptiſm. Parvulorum*) ſpeaking of this point; *That which the Univerſal* Church *holds, and was not inſtituted by Councils, but yet always held, is moſt rightly believed to be delivered down to us by no other then Apoſtolical Authority.* If Apoſtolical Authority be not a ſure ground for belief; upon what ground have we received all our Writings as Divine? This Authority ſecured St. *Auſten* in the belief of a neceſſary point not contained in Scripture. The like Authority may alſo as well ſecure us all in thoſe other neceſſary points, which we have ſhewed to be contained in no Scripture.

6. What I have ſaid will be much confirmed by another neceſſary point, which alſo is not contained in any Scripture. It is a Damnable Hereſie to affirm that thoſe who were Baptized by Hereticks, ought to be Baptized again. This Controverſie was moved in the dayes of St. *Cyprian;* and he was a Man as able to ſee that which was clearly ſet down in Scripture, as any of you all: Yet, as appears by his firſt Book of Epiſtles (*Ep.* 6.) and other places, he did really Judge the Scripture to teach, that all thoſe were to be Re-baptized, who had been Baptized by Hereticks. On this ground he held that Opinion. And for the ſame Opinion, ſaies *Vincentius Lerinenſis*, there ſtood *ſo great force of Wit, ſuch torrents of Eloquence, ſo great a number of Patrons, ſo great apparance of Truth, ſo many Oracles of Scripture tho' miſinterpreted.* How come they to be overthrown? He tells you a little before; *Then Pope* Stephen *of bleſſed Memory, the* Biſhop *of the Apoſtolick* Sea, *together with his fellow* Biſhops, *yet more then any other, did reſiſt them; eſteeming it, as I think, a worthy thing, if he did*

did ſurpaſs all the reſt in Devotion of Faith, as he ſurpaſſed them in the Authority of his place. In fine, *in that Epiſtle of his, which was ſent into* Africa, *he decreed with theſe Words: That nothing ought to be innovated; but that to be retained which was delivered down to us.* Hence, ſaies this Holy Father, the end of the buſineſs was that; *Antiquity kept Poſſeſſion.* And he adds, *ſtrange change of things. The Authors of this ſelf ſame Opinion are Judged* Catholicks, *and their followers* Hereticks. *The Maſters of* it *are abſolved, and the Diſciples condemned.* So he: For it was not a neceſſary point of belief, before the Church had declared this Opinion to be contrary to true Faith, becauſe it was contrary to Tradition; now in a Council examined by the Church, and found to be full and ſtrong enough to aſſure us of the Apoſtles Authority in this point. And ſo St. *Cyprian* and others did hold the contrary Opinion, and were not Hereticks: But all thoſe who after this Declaration, oppoſed this Tradition thus examined, and proved for Apoſtolical, were, for that very oppoſition of ſuch a Tradition adjudged Hereticks. Neither were they before adjudged to be Hereticks for their oppoſing the Scripture as clear in that point. No ſuch thing was ever ſo much as Objected againſt them. Hence that great *African* Doctor St. *Auſten*, ſpeaking of this very point of Re-baptization, Writes thus, *De Unitate Eccl. c. 22. This is neither openly nor evidently read* (in Scripture) *either by you or by me: Yet if there were any Wiſe Man, of whom our* Saviour *had given Teſtimony, and* that *he ſhould be conſulted in this Queſtion; we ſhould make no doubt* (Mark this all you who oppoſe the infallibility of the Church) to *perform what he ſhould ſay; leaſt we ſhould ſeem not ſo much to gainſay him, as to gainſay* CHRIST, *by whoſe Teſtimony he was recommended. Now* CHRIST *bears witneſs to his* Church. Mark alſo this Reaſon, and confert it with all thoſe Teſtimonies given by Scripture to the Church, which I cited the laſt *Sect. n.* 1. and then mark St. *Auſtens* conſequence, which is; *whoſoever refuſes to follow the practiſe of the* Church,

does resist our Saviour *himself who by his Testimony commends the* Church. Go now, and tell St. *Austen* that seeing neither he nor you could find this point in Scripture, therefore it is not necessary to hold with the Church in this point, for which She has only Tradition: You shall see if he will not again tell you, as clearly as I do, that as you should oppose CHRIST himself, if you refused to obey some one Man, whom *Christ* should bid you obey in points of belief; *and you should not so much disobey the Man, as you should disobey* Christ *Authorizing this Man;* so being that CHRIST bids you obey the Church, you should not so much disobey the Church in refusing to obey Her in points of Faith, as you should disobey *Christ* who Authorized the Church, and invested Her with this Power in the Texts cited, *Sect. 7. n. 1.*

7. Hear again St. *Austen* de Baptismo contra Donatistas, *lib.* 15. *c.* 23. *The Apostles* (in Scripture) *have prescribed nothing concerning this thing;* (the point I speak of) *but this costume, which was opposite to St.* Cyprian, *ought to be believed to have taken is* Otigen *from their Tradition. As there are many things* (note that he speaks in a matter necessary to be believed) *which the Universal* Church *observes; and for that Reason* (O Excellent Reason!) *are rightly believed to have been commanded by the Apostles, altho' they are not found in their Writings.* Give me leave here to ask; whether it be not Damnable, to refuse the Observation of that, which upon so good a Reason, (as is the Testimony of the Universal Church,) is rightly believed to have been Commanded by the Apostles? Sure I am that you cannot have the thousand part of so good a Testimony, that such an one is your Father; no, nor that such an one is your Mother: And yet it is Damnable to refuse to obey them. Tell me then, tell me; I say tell me, why should it not be much more Damnable, to refuse Obedience in a point (*for example, the Fast of* Lent) which the Universal Church testifies, that it is rightly believed to have been Commanded by the Apostles. Whence Mr. *Cartwright* in his second Reply against

gainſt *Whitg. par.* 1. ſaies. *If* St. Auſtens *Judgement be a good Judgement; then there be ſome things commanded of God, which are not in Scriptures.* *Whitakers* and *Reynolds* Words ſpeak much to that Effect. See alſo St. *Auſten's lib.* 2. contra Donat. *c.* 7. and my *Sect.* 21. *n.* 5.

8. Here I might ſhew out of moſt evident Texts of Holy Fathers, that the Apoſtles did make the Faſt of Lent a matter of Precept; and conſequently the breach of it to be Damnable, and the obſervance of it neceſſary to Salvation. See St. *Leo Serm* 6. *Serm.* 9. St. *Ambroſe Serm.* 25. *Serm.* 34. *Serm.* 36. St. *Hier. Epiſt* 54. St. *Auſten fully Serm.* 62. And ſee him preſently againſt *Aerius* Alſo that thoſe are Judged Hereticks by the Church, and called *Quarta-decimani*, who would needs obſerve Eaſter on the fourteenth of the Moon, tho' it were not Sunday: Yet no clear Scripture was againſt them; but they were againſt the Church. So for the ſame Reaſon *Aerius* is liſted for an Heretick; and one of his Hereſies is related by St. *Auſten* (in his Book of Hereſie, *Hereſy* 53.) to be this: *He taught private Opinions of his own, ſaying; That we muſt not Pray or offer for the Dead; and that the ſolemnly approved Faſts not to be kept; that every Man was to* Faſt *when he pleaſed; that he might not ſeem to be under the Law.* Were not theſe Hereſies good *Proteſtant* Doctrine? So is that which follows; *If* at *all I will* Faſt, *I will chooſe any day of my ſelf; and I will* Faſt that *day to ſhew my Liberty;* ſaies that ſame Heretick in St. *Epiphan.* his Catalogue: *Her.* 72. I might alſo add that St. *Auſten*, in the ſame Book (*Her.* 84.) puts down for Hereticks, the *Heluidians*; for affirming that the *Virgin Mary* had other Children after the Birth of our Saviour. And there is no clear Text of Scripture againſt them. Yea St. *Jerome* ſweats hard to Anſwer all the Texts of Scripture which *Helvidius* brought: See his Book againſt that Heretick: whoſe Heretical followers St. *Epiphanius* in his Catalogue calls *Antidicomaritas*, I might alſo add ſeveral ſuch points; *as to communicate* Faſting, *and but once in the day*: And ſuch like points

points wholly neceſſary for our obſervance; and whoſe Tranſgreſſion is Damnable: Yet, to be liberal, I will take all theſe laſt points ſpecified in this Number, only for one. Now, for the Peoples ſake, who are moſt capable of that point, I will add one more in a Section apart; and ſo will make the former nineteen points to be juſt two dozen, by the Addition of theſe four points explicated in this Section, and of that other point which follows. I ſhall add alſo another *Sect.* 16. *n.* 2. And yet another *Sect.* 20. *n.* 4. And yet another *Sect.* 21. *n.* 5.

SECTION IX.

A THIRTEENTH ARGUMENT.

A four and twentieth neceſſary point not contained in Scripture.

1. ALL things ſay you, which are neceſſary either to be believed or done, for obtaining Salvation, are clearly put down in Scripture: I now, by a four and twentieth inſtance, ſhew this to be falſe. That is neceſſarily to be done to Salvation, which left undone cauſes Damnation; But the obſervation of the Sunday, (commanding the abſtaining from all ſervile works) if neglected, or left undone, brings Damnation; therefore to obſerve in this manner the Sunday, is a thing neceſſary to Salvation. And yet this point is ſo far from being clearly put down in Scripture, that, ſtanding meerly to the ſole Judgement of Scripture, we can ſhew far clearer Texts for ſtill obſerving the *Saturday*; then for the Lawfulneſs of Working upon that Day, and the unlawfulneſs of Working upon the Sunday: For neither of theſe have ſo much as one clear Text: But the ſtill keeping of the Saturday (for all thoſe who

who hold Scripture the only Rule of Faith and neceſſary Practice) has many Texts, wholly Unanſwerable; if this main Controverſie between us and the *Sabatharians* be to be tryed by Scripture as the only Judge. And it is impoſſible for you, by Scripture only, to convince the *Æthiopians*, who are ſaid to obſerve both the Saturday and the Sunday; grounding themſelves alſo in the Apocryphal Recognitions of St. *Clement lib 7. c. 24.* Where the Saturday is commanded to be kept, as well as the Sunday, ſee *Bellar. lib. de Scrip. in Clim.*

2. It is ſuperfluous to cite the many Texts, by which God commanded reſt from all Work upon the Saturday, which was the ſeventh day; *becauſe it was the day on which our Lord reſted.* And it was not any one day in ſeven, but the ſeventh day, of which (and not of any other among the ſeven dayes) it is ſaid; *and God bleſſed the ſeventh day, and ſanctified it; becauſe in that* (and not in any other) *he had reſted from all his Work. Gen.* 2. How comes this bleſſing given to no other day among the ſeven, but given to the ſeventh day only, to be loſt? Who took away the Sanctification of it, given by God himſelf; and given for a Reaſon, which is as obliging now as ever? Give me a Text, which tells us (and that clearly) that this Sanctification was ever taken away. If you contend, that a new Sanctification was given to the Sunday, becauſe our Saviour did reſt that day; let it be ſo, to the Honour of his Holy Name: But where do you Read, that, at the giving of this new Sanctification (for which alſo you have no clear Text) the former Sanctification given to the ſeventh day, on which God reſted, was taken away from that day? Again, the day of our Saviours Aſcenſion to Heaven was upon the Thurſday, and that may exceeding properly, be called the final Period of all his Actions: What clear Text of Scripture tells you, that any particular Sanctification was given to the Sunday in Honour of our Saviours Reſurrection, more then was given to the Thurſday in the Honour of His Aſcenſion?

3. But

3. But ſtanding to the New Scripture only, I will ſhew that we have ſtronger Texts, reſting in the ſtrength of the Text only, (as you will have us,) for ſtill Sanctifying the ſeventh day or Saturday; then for Sunday. I will give you Text for Text; and let any reaſonable Man Judge whether the Text be not more clear for Saturday, then for Sunday. I have in the *Revelations*, that St. *John was in Spirit upon our Lords day*; that is Sunday. What then? Is every day to be Sanctified, by abſtaining all the World over from all Work, becauſe St. *John* had a *Revelation* on that day; as alſo he had on many? O but hence it is clear there was ſuch a Day as our Lords day: So it is. But how do you prove from hence; that the Sanctification given to Saturday was taken from that day? Or that there was given a Command to all the World not to Work upon that day which was called our Lords day? How prove you that by Scripturre only; Or that it was not the day of the Reſurrection, or Aſcenſion, or *Chriſt*-maſs day which St. *John* called our Lords day? Now give us as good an anſwer (if you can) to the Text I ſhall bring for ſtill keeping the Saturday. We are ſtill obliged to keep all thoſe Commandements which our Saviour did bid us keep with his own Mouth; But he did with his own Mouth bid us keep the whole Decalogue, or thoſe ten Commandements given to *Moſes*, in the very ſenſe which the *Jews* underſtood them; Who did underſtand, that by *Remembring to Sanctifie the* Sabbath-*Day*, they were obliged to Sanctifie the Saturday. I prove what I have ſaid out of the 10. of St. *Matt.* where we read that one came to our Saviour, ſaying; *what good ſhall I do, that I may have life everlaſting?* Our Saviour anſwered; *If thou will enter into life, keep the Commandments.* And when that Man replied to know *what Commandments* our Saviour meant? Our dear Lord did clearly explicate himſelf to mean all the Commandments of the Decalogue given to *Moſes*; thoſe very Commandments which this Man knew very well, as appears alſo by *Mark* 10. *Luke* 18. You ſee here the very Author of our New Law,

with

with his own Mouth, requiring no leſs the keeping of this Commandment, as neceſſary for our entrance into Life Everlaſting, then the keeping of any other Commandement.

4. Give me your ſecond Text for the Sunday, and I will return a more clear one for the Saturday. Your beſt Text is, *Act.* 20. *v.* 7. *And upon the firſt day of the Week when the Diſciples came together to break Bread*, Paul *preached unto them, ready to depart on the Morrow.* Hence (will you ſay) it appears, that the firſt Chriſtians were accuſtomed to Communicate upon the firſt day of the Week; which was Sunday. I anſwer firſt, that it is not clear out of the Text that they uſed to do ſo; but that they did ſo that particular Sunday: Of which a very good Reaſon may be given out of the Words following, telling us that, St. *Paul was ready to depart on the Morrow.* Wherefore thoſe firſt fervent Chriſtians might all Aſſemble themſelves to communicate at the hands of ſo great an Apoſtle before his departure; and they being Aſſembled, the Zealous St. *Paul* made them a Sermon: But you have no where that he Preached every Sunday. But I have clear Text for his Preaching every Saturday. *For he diſputed in the Synagogue every Sabbath and he exhorted the* Jews *and the* Greeks. *Act.* 18. Again no wonder they Aſſembled to communicate that day before St. *Pauls* departure, becauſe they were uſed then to Communicate every Day, as many Doctors ſay, or wonderful frequently, as is ſtrongly gathered by that Text, *Act.* 2. 46. *and they continuing daily* (mark the Word *daily*) *with one accord in the Temple, breaking Bread from Houſe to Houſe.* Thirdly, how does their communicating upon Sunday take away the Sanctification wch God himſelf gave to the ſeventh day ſetting that day apart from all ſervile Work? again, do you think they never Worked on that day of their Communion, who Communicated daily or exceeding frequently? Is their Communicating once upon a Sunday enough to prove, that all the World muſt never more Work on the Sunday? And that from that day, it ſhall be ever Lawful to Work on the Saturday? Is ſuch a Text clear enough to aboliſh a precept

clearly confirmed by the Mouth of the Author of the New Law? My ſecond Text for ſtill keeping Saturday, is far clearer, out of 1 *Cor.* 7. 19. *Circumciſion is nothing, and prepuce is nothing, but the Obſervation of the Commandments of God;* that is the thing we muſt now look after, if we will have Life Everlaſting. Behold here that great Apoſtle of the New Law does tell us, that even then *when Cercumciſion was* quite aboliſhed and made *nothing*, yet the Obſervation of the Commandments (of which the Sanctifying the ſeventh day, or Saturday, was one) did ſtill ſtand good, and in its full Obſervance: So that we have now our Saviour himſelf, and three of the four Evangeliſts, and St. *Paul*, for the Obſervation of the ſeventh day, as much as for the keeping of the other Commandments.

5. Let us hear your laſt Text; for you have but three. It is 1. *Cor.* 16. *Now concerning the collections for the Saints, as I have given order to the Churches of Galatia, even ſo do yee upon the firſt day of the Week;* (that is Sunday) *let every one of you lay by him in ſtore as God hath proſpered him, that there be no gathering when I come.* A very weak place to aboliſh an old known and ſtill obſerved Commandment, confirmed by Chriſts Mouth; and to bring in a new Obligation upon all the World forever. I pray mark, that it is not ſo much as ſaid, that theſe Monies were to be gathered when the People did meet at the Church upon Sundaies: But, *Let every one lay up by himſelf in ſtore;* for which Work ſome one day of the week was to be appointed; St. *Paul* thought fit to appoint the firſt day for a pious begining. But how will you deduce from hence by evident conſequence (as you muſt) that he gave them leave to Work the day before, and obliged them, and all others not to Work that day, untill the Worlds end? Neither this, nor any other place can be brought out of the whole Bible, from which his conſequence can be evidently inferred. And now comes my turn, to give you a third and far more evident Text, for the ſtill Sanctifying the Sabath or ſe-

ſeventh day: For my Text ſhall ſhew, that ſtanding to Scripture only, the ſeventh day was of Command to be obſerved long after St. *Paul* did ſay thoſe Words; and long after the practice of Communicating upon Sundaies was in the Church. My Text is, *Mat.* 24. *v.* 20. *But pray you that your flight be not in the Winter, neither on the Sabbath-day.* Hence our *Saviour* foretels clearly the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem* (which was to happen in the Year of our Lord 73.) that is forty Years after the Reſurrection of *Chriſt*. Then, if ever a Man would think the Command for the Obſervation of the Sabbath, or ſeventh day, to have been aboliſhed; ſo that it could not be prophaned: And yet our *Saviour* did bid his Apoſtles, (for to them he ſpoke theſe Words;) *Pray that this flight might not be upon the Sabbath or ſeventh-day*, to avoid the prophanation of that day; on which *Jeruſalem* was taken, and Pillaged. And there was beſides a perpetual Maſſacring, a perpetual Pillaging, and carrying their Goods to places of ſecurity; as alſo a perpetual Flight of thoſe *Jews* which could Fly, and carry away their Goods if they could, or endeavouring to carry them, or ſweating with inceſſant Labour to hide them, by which Actions the prophanation might ſeem to be committed. Therefore all the places alledged before hand do not convince, that the Obligation of not prophaning the Sabbath-day was taken away: As alſo they convince no new Obligation of not Workiug upon the Sunday to be brought in. For both theſe things I ask for Scripture, and nothing but Scripture: For it is nothing to our purpoſe, to bring Reaſons why the Sabbath might be taken away; and this Obligation of not Working upon the Sunday might be introduced: But you, who affirm not the poſſibility only of the Fact, but the real Fact of aboliſhing Saturday, and inſtituting Sunday; you, I ſay, muſt prove both theſe things with clear Texts, or elſe your meer diſcourſes & reaſonings will not be half ſo good Arguments as our conſtant Tradition of the Church, which you abſolutly deny to deliver down to us any neceſſary Obligation, not clearly expreſſed in Scripture. Your own Dr. *Taylor* in his

Defence of Epiſcopacy, *p.* 100. confeſſes the plain Truth. *For* that (ſaies he, ſpeaking of the keeping of the Sunday) *in the New Teſtament we have no precept; and nothing but the Example of the primitive Diſciples: At* Geneva *they were once about changing Sundaies Feaſt into a Thurſday, to ſhew their Chriſtian Liberty.* So he. Had the contrary been plainly ſet down, your ſo illuminated Brethren of *Geneva* ſhould have ſeen it. Give me then infallible Texts, and not fallible diſcourſes concerning the abrogating of the Saturday, and Inſtitution of the Sundays Feaſt in place of it.

6. But I have a new difficulty in this matter, which is objected by no Body that I know of, becauſe it is not very obvious. My difficulty is this; that we are bound under pain of Damnation, to keep our Sunday in a manner, not only not expreſſed in any clear Scripture, but alſo againſt the uſual manner of keeping the Sabbath, and all Feſtival daies, expreſſed in clear Scripture. For, according to clear Scripture we are to begin the Sabbath or Feaſt on the Evening before, and to end it the next Evening: As is clear out of the twentieth three Chapter of *Leviticus*, where all the Old Sabbaths and Feaſts, and the manner of keeping of them are put down *From Evening to Evening ſhall you celebrate your Sabbaths.* It was then forbidden, under pain of Damnation, to Work on Friday after the Evening: In ſo much that a *Taylor*, *Shoemaker*, *Weaver*, &c. who ſhould have continued Working for any long time between Sunſet and twelve a Clock at Night, ſhould have been damned for his Labour: And yet at the next Evening he might Lawfully have Worked untill Mid-Night: But I hope there is no ſuch thing held Lawful on Sunday after the Evening; neither is it unlawful to do any, tho' never ſo Laborious Work, upon Saturday Evening untill Mid-night. Here then you have another Obligation under pain of Damnation, which is not plainly put down in Scripture; but delivered unto us by the Tradition of the ſame Church, which delivers the Obligation of Faſting in *Lent* unto

to us. Wherefore none of you all can ſhew any ground, upon which any Obligation of keeping the Sunday, and keeping of it in this manner *(which I now ſpecified)* can be grounded ſolidly; but upon the very ſelf ſame ground we will as ſolidly ground the Obligation of *Lent* with a Faſt of precept (as I ſhewed *Sect.* 8. *n.* 8.) as much as Sunday is a Feaſt of precept. This Argument will trouble Dr. *Ferne Sect.* 13. moſt inconſequently to his other Principles, holds the Obligation of keeping the Lords Day, made plainly known unto us by Tradition only: And yet holds that in the Scripture only all neceſſary Obligations are ſet down plainly: Plain Contradiction.

SECTION X.

A FOURTEENTH ARGUMENT.

By the Texts which our Adverſaries bring to prove that Scripture contains, and decides all neceſſary Controverſies; we prove the contrary.

1. ALL of you ſay, that all things which are neceſſary to be believed or done for obtaining Salvation, are clearly put down in Scripture: Therefore if it be neceſſary to our Salvation to believe Scripture to be by it ſelf alone our only Rule of Faith, or to hold that by it ſelf alone it decides all neceſſary Controverſies; the Scripture muſt alſo be ſhewed by you clearly to contain and determine all this: For elſe you preſs us to hold that which no clear Scripture bids us to hold; which thing you all account unreaſonable in us. Your part is here affirmative; and in this prime point you contradict the practiſe of all the Church; againſt ſo great and ſo

publick Authority, you muſt bring the evidence of clear Scripture, according to your own Principles: If we then can but ſhew that all the Texts you bring do not ſuffice to this evidence, you are condemned, even by your own Principles. Let us then hear your Texts: And that out of *D. Ferne*: For he has the chief of them.

2. The firſt Text which is brought by Dr. *Ferne* labouring in his *Sect.* 23. to ſatisfie my doubt, is this; *For in them* (the Scriptures) *Ye think ye have Salvation. Joan. 5. v.* 39. I pray mark what I ſay; and you ſhall ſee how weak this and other ſuch like Arguments are. In the ſeventeenth verſe of this Chapter begins a diſconrſe of our Saviours to the Jews; and when he comes to the 34. verſe, he ſaies; *Theſe things I ſay unto you, that you may be ſaved.* Now my anſwer is this: That which our Saviour ſaid unto them, *that they might be ſaved*, is a ſtronger proof that that alone by it ſelf was ſufficient to Salvation, without any thing elſe; then to ſay, *The Jews did think by ſuch a thing to have Salvation; Therefore that thing by it ſelf alone does (without any more) ſuffice to Salvation:* For undoubtedly our Saviours ſaying ſuch a thing, is better then the Jews thinking ſuch a thing. This ſuppoſed, would you not count him mad who ſhould ſay that thoſe precedent verſes, which our Saviour had then ſaid when he ſpoke theſe words, *Theſe things I ſay unto you that you may be ſaved*, did contain alone a clear expreſſion of all particular neceſſary points diſtinctly putting them all down? How then does it follow, that becauſe the Jews did think (and perhaps truly think) to find that which might ſave them in the Scripture, therefore the Scripture did contain alone a clear expreſſion of all particular neceſſary points, diſtinctly putting them all down? Wherefore, as you muſt not underſtand that ſhort ſpeech made by our Saviour to have ſufficed to Salvation, by expreſſing diſtinctly all particular points neceſſary: But becauſe it did ſuffice to bring them to the knowledge of the true *Meſſias*, whom they acknow-

acknowledging might, by his particular inſtruction, know diſtinctly all particular neceſſary points: So the Scripture did ſuffice to Salvation, by expreſſing clearly enough that *Jeſus Chriſt* was the true Saviour of the World whom they could not but believe if they would believe *Moſes*: *For had ye believed* Moſes, *ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me; ſaies* our Lord in the ſame Chapter *v.* 46. believing then our Saviour they ſhould from him (and his Church after him) receive full inſtruction in every particular neceſſary point. But Dr. *Ferne* urges this place wonderfull weakely; becauſe (ſaies he) they might know all things neceſſary to Salvation (by Scripture only,) therefore he bids them *ſearch the Scripture*, and they ſhould find *they teſtified of him.* A weak conſequence to prove that they might know all neceſſary points out of Scripture, becauſe they might know this one point of our Saviours being the true *Meſſias.* For it is no conſequence, This one point is clear in Scripture: Therefore all other neceſſary points are clear in Scripture. My ſecond anſwer is, *Go and ſearch the Scriptures* now and ye ſhall find Salvation in them; for they will clearly ſend you to the Church for your particular inſtruction in all points neceſſary; as I ſhewed *Sect. 7. n. 1. Thirdly ſearch the Scriptures and you ſhall find Salvation in them;* but not in them as expounded by every man for himſelf (for theſe very men found not Salvation by them as they underſtood them;) but you ſhall find Salvation by them as expounded by the publick Interpretation of the Church. And as it is no conſequence, *Chriſt* did bid the Jews ſearch thoſe Scriptures which they had then, becauſe in them, they ſhould find clearly put down, that one point of his being the *Meſſias*; therefore thoſe Scriptures and all the new Teſtament (of which no one word was then written) are affirmed by Chriſt to contain all points now neceſſary, and to put all down clearly: So alſo it is no conſequence, *Chriſt* bid us *ſearch the Scriptures*; Therefore we are to attend to them alone, and not

to

to attend also to the voice of his Heavenly Father, bidding us hear him; nor to the voice of Christ himself testifying of himself; nor to the voice of his Miracles, which he calls *a testimony greater then Iohn.* Nor are we to attend to the voice of John, altho' he was sent on set purpose *to bear witness of the light*, Joh. 1. 7, 8. And yet all these consequences be as good as this your consequence: *Christ bids us search the the Scriptures, therefore we must attend to them alone, and take them alone to be of sufficient Authority to ground Faith in all points necessary, and not attend to the Church.* I will give you a consequence, tho' most bad, yet to the full as good as this: *St. Paul* saies, *If Women will learn any thing let them ask their Husbands at home.* (1 Cor. 14. 35. Therefore Women are to attend only to what their Husbands teach them at home; and not to go to the Church to be instructed in points necessary by the Minister. But after all this I must tell you (*Mr. Doctor*) for a *fourth Answer*, that you assume that which it is impossible for any of us all to prove; that is, that our Saviour did bid them search the Scriptures. *St. John* did write in Greek, and the Greek word (*Ereunate*) as also the Latin *Scrutamini*, does as commonly, and as properly signifie *You do search*, (in the indicative mode) as, *Do search*, (in the Imperative:) And therefore the Translator of your Bible might, according to the Original, as well have put it, not as he did, but thus; *you do search the Scriptures, because ye think ye have Salvation in them;* of which notwithstanding they did miss with all their search. If we read (as we may) *you do search*; then this place evidently proves, that the search of the Scriptures only does not suffice to Salvation: And therefore it is as probable (to the very full) that this Text makes against you, as that it makes for you. And this Interpretation of mine is not only the Interpretation of S. *Cyrill lib.* 3. in *John c.* 4. but also your learned *Beza* saies; *I do assent to Cyrill expresly admonishing that these words (Ereunate) &c.* ought rather to be taken in the Indicaive mode, *You do search the Scriptures.*

How

How often have Proteſtants heard us give this unavoidable anſwer; and yet they, being never able to anſwer it, will never give over the citeing of it, as if it were a main proof of this Fundamental point of their Religion? An evident ſign of their want of evident Texts. Again, the knowledge of the only Rule of Faith is neceſſary for all: But Chriſt did not bid all Common People *ſearch the Scriptures*; for at that time the Scriptures were not in the Syriack Language at all; which only Language the People of the Jews *could underſtand*. *See this proved Sect. 2. n.* 11.

3. *Dr. Ferns ſecond Text* is; They (the Scriptures) *are able to make wiſe unto Salvation.* He preſſes it thus; *Can that be ſaid to be able to make a man wiſe to ſuch a purpoſe and only do in part, and imperfectly, teaching him only ſome knowing to that purpoſe?* Alſo he ſaies after, *v.* 17. *The man of God is throughly furniſhed, or perfected to every good Work.* I anſwer, that the ſhort ſpeech which our Saviour made, intending it (as I ſhewed in the former Objection) *to make thoſe wiſe to Salvation.* was truly able to do what he intended, and that perfectly; or elſe he had miſled in the choice of a means ſufficient to that end, which he clearly ſaid he intended; to wit, *that they might be ſaved*: yet you cannot ſay, that ſpeech, by it ſelf alone, ſufficed *to make them wiſe to Salvation*; but it did inable them with ſufficient Principles, by following of which Salvation might be effectually obtained; and ſo that ſpeech was able, not in part and imperfectly only, to work the effect, by giving ſome knowledge to that purpoſe; but that very knowledge which that ſhort ſpeech gave; was a knowledge effectual for the direction of all thoſe Jews; not by directing them in every particular, but by telling them clearly whence all particular directions were to be had, which any one following will ſoon prove *a man of God perfect, throughly furniſhed to all good Works.* Is not all this true even of that ſhort ſpeech? Much more is it true of ſo many ſpeeches made to us in Scripture *for our Salvation*, and able to bring us

effectually to it, if we follow them, especially such speeches as bid us so often to follow the Church. See the many places I cited *S. 7. n. 1.* These Scriptures then so full of these speeches, and these Divine Writings expounded, not by private, but by publick exposition of the Church, *do not in part only and imperfectly, work this effect; by teaching us some knowledges to that effect*: But they teach us a great sum of such knowledges, as are able to effect the work, tho' not by giving us every particular point to be done, but by telling us whence every particular point might securely be had. Yet to give you fuller satisfaction; I say, it was far from St. *Pauls* mind to say the Scriptures *are able to make us wise to salvation*, as they are used by those, who take them as Interpreted according to that sense, that every man shall in his Conscience judge to be true. The Scripture thus taken, breeds infinite inconveniencies, as I shewed at large, *Sect. 7.* Whence appears that the Scriptures used so, are the cause of many mens damnation. St. *Paul* then did not speak of the Scriptures taken so (as you do;) but he saies, *they were able to make* Timothie *wise to Salvation*; because he was indeed *a man of God who did continue in the things which he learned and had been assured of*; to wit, by the Oral Tradition of the Doctors of the Church, and by St. *Paul* himself. For so St. *Paul* teaches me in the begining of his former Chapter saying to *Timothie*; *Thou therefore (my Son) be strong in the Grace, that is in Christ Jesus, and in the things which thou hast heard of me among many witnesses*. And in the Chapter before that *v. 13. Hold fast the form of sound words which thou hast heard of me.* Yea and in this third Chapter, *But thou hast fully known my Doctrine, Manner of Life*, &c. All this Doctrine he could not have known by any Scripture, of which a small part was then Written. Give me then a *Timothie*, a man so well Preinstructed by Tradition, so fast a holder of Traditions, and a man so knowing from whom he had learned these things; and I will freely allow you, that

the

the *Scriptures will make ſuch a man wiſe to Salvation;* For he will be ſure to take them, not upon any private mans judgment, or upon his own, but to take them as Interpreted by the Church, whom he will be ſure never to contradict; ſhe being the Pillar and Ground of Truth, as that his great Maſter ſaies, *all whoſe Doctrine* he fully knew. But thoſe Scriptures which *are able to make ſuch a man of God, ſuch a* Timothie, *wiſe to Salvation, and throughly furniſhed or perfected to every good work*, are not able to do this effect, if uſed in a manner contrary to that which I have ſhewed they were uſed by him, and ſhould be uſed by us. We do abuſe them if we take them and Diſcanon them (as I may ſay) by our private Interpretations, contrary to the Tradition, and unanimous expoſition of the Church. Theſe Men uſe Scriptures *to their Perdition* as St. *Peter* ſaies ſome did the hard places of St. *Pauls* Epiſtles: Whence you ſee that miſinterpretations *of hard places* were made *to the Perdition* of the Interpreters. Wonder not then to hear us ſay that the obſcurity of ſome places of Scripture have occaſioned the Perdition of the falſe Interpreters of thoſe places, out of which ſtate of Perdition ſome guide there muſt be who can lead them ſecurely: Can you find me a ſurer then the Church? There is no want of Infallibility in Scripture but there is great abundance of fallibility in our private Judgement of Diſcretion, which makes us need a ſure guide in the Interpretation thereof.

4. Having now ſhewed in what ſenſe the Text alledged did ſay, *The Scripture was able to make a man wiſe to Salvation;* I ſhall eaſily ſhew how weakly from theſe words St. *Paul* is ſaid to have meant, *That the Scripture by it ſelf alone was ſufficient for Doctrine, for Reproof, for Correction, for Inſtruction in Righteouſneſs; that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furniſhed to all good works.* I then freely grant the Scripture ſufficient for all this, but ſtill in the ſame ſenſe that I have explicated the Scripture to be able to make a man wiſe to Salvation; to wit, as Interpretedby the Church,

or as understood by men well preinstructed by Tradition, who will be sure in all doubts to have recourse to the Church; and esteem as much what Tradition teaches the Apostles to have said, as what their Books teach them to have written: Their words being of the same Authority unwritten as written; and Tradition being a more uncorrupt deliverer of their Doctrine, then writing; which is subject to be so many wayes corrupted, and altered, and of which we are only certified that it is Apostolical by the Tradition of the self same Church, which does as well certifie us that other Doctrines be Apostolical, besides those written in this Book. Here also I must tell you how *Mr. Fisher* did excellently silence *Dr. White*, when in their publick conference he urges, this Text, *the Scripture is profitable*: &c. For, said he, *Altho' Wood be profitable to make the substance of a House, to make Wainescot, Stools, Tables, and other Furniture; yet hence does not follow Wood alone is sufficient to build and furnish a House*: So *Scripture is profitable for all these ends, but alone it is not sufficient.* Whence all the weight of your Argument comes to this; that if it be so profitable as to make a man wise to Salvation, it must be sufficient by it self alone to do so: Which I have already shewed to be false; without you take the whole Canon of Scripture as Interpreted by the Holy Church, or as understood by those who are preinstructed by Traditions, as *Timothie* was.

5. Indeed you say, *this sufficiency belongs to the whole Scripture, tho' in proportion only to every Book*; and therefore the Apostle said, *that Scriptures are able to make a Man wise to Salvation.* How they are able to do this, I have shewed; But Mr. Doctor of what Scriptures did St. *Paul* say these Words if he did say these Words of the whole Cannon of the Scriptures which we now have, and to which you stretch these Words; this place cannot possibly prove that this sufficiency belongs to the whole Scriptures we now have: But it is evident he did not speak these Words of the whole Canon of the Scripture which we now have, for almost all the new Scripture was as then not Written. How could

could that, which was not at all, have a being then able to make *Timothie* Wise to Salvation? St. *Paul* spoke of the sufficiency (if you please) of all Scriptures which were then extant. You deny this sufficiency to them, and you say: *It belongs to the whole Scripture, tho' in proportion to every Book:* Therefore it belonged in proportion only to those Books which were Written then. Why did St. *Paul* then say of those Books, then extant that they were able to make a man wise to Salvation? Now answer your own Argument. Again; if every Book of Scripture contributes its proportionable part, to make up a whole body of Books compleatly sufficient to this purpose; how will you do now, when no fewer then twenty Books of the Scripture are quite lost, as I have shewed *Sect.* 1. *n.* 7. We have not any thing like a Text, by which we can prove that these 20. Books were not as requisite to make up this full sufficiencie of the whole Canon, to decide all Controversies, as any other twenty which we have; especially if you except the four Gospels. And yet the Original of one of these Gospels is also quite lost; and we have no surer ground for that belief, by which we believe our selves to have the true Copy of it, then the Tradition of the Church: If she be fallible in Her Traditions, we cannot believe any thing in St. *Matthews* Gospel: as I shewed *Sect.* 6.

6. Whereas you object that, *tho' the Scripture did contain more things plainly in it self, and shew us from whence we may have the rest, that is from the Church: Yet thus the Scripture could not be said to make us perfect, for so the Law might be said to make us perfect, because it shews us Christ, and was a Schoolmaster to him. Gal.* 3. *And* John Baptist *might have been said to have perfected his Disciples by shewing them Christ* So you. I answer, that you all fight against this objection with every Text you bring in this controversie against us: For as the two former, So all the following Texts objected against us, speak of the Old Testament, or Law; for *In that* (*Christ* said) *the* Jews *thought*

to find Salvation; of that he ſaid, *ſearch the Scriptures*; of that St. *Paul* ſaid, *It was able to make a man wiſe to Salvation, it was profitable, ſo that by it the man of God is throughly furniſhed or perfected* (mark that Word) to *every good work*. And now behold you your ſelf come and infer for an abſurdity, that the old Scripture ſhould be able to do this. We freely acknowledge that the Law of it ſelf could perfect no man, no nor juſtify any man, as St. *Paul* clearly ſaies in the place cited: But they were all to be juſtified by Faith in Chriſt. The Law, as introducing to this, did ſufficiently perfect all thoſe, who were perfect under the Law: Independently of this, it did not do ſo. As for St. *John*; you are clearly told by St. *Luke* c. 1. *v.* 13. that he was ſent *Parare Domino plebem perfectam, to prepare to our Lord a perfect People*: And towards the end of that Chapter, *Thou Child ſhalt be called the Prophet of the Higheſt: For thou ſhalt go before the Face of the Lord to prepare for his wayes, to give knowledge of Salvation unto his People by the remiſſion of their Sins*. Can you ſhew the Scripture does more in this point then it ſaies St. *John* did?

7. Your third Text is, *You ſhall not add to the Word which I ſpeak unto you, nor take from it. Deut.* 4 2 Therefore the Scripture is ſo perfect, and ſo ſufficient, that it alone contains all neceſſaries; *and therefore condems the ſuperadded Traditions*. You have forgot *Mr. Doctor* your very *laſt Words*; *That the* Law (chiefly contained in *Deutronomy*) *could not make us perfect*: And now you bring theſe Words as Words implying the perfection and ſufficiency of it; For of it alone theſe Words are ſpoken. *Secondly*, you have forgot your very firſt Words of this your 23. *Sect.* where you put three ſorts of Tradition that you allow there, and *Sect.* 13. Be not theſe Additions to the Written Word? *Thirdly*, you have forgot that the Jews had at leaſt two undenyable Traditions, beſides thoſe which delivered the Scriptures and the true ſenſe of the Scriptures unto them: For firſt, they knew only

by Tradition *what remedy was to be used to free their Female Children from Original Sin;* as also, *to free their Male Children in danger of Death before the eight day.* This remedy they knew and observed, and were bound to know and observe, and yet they infallibly knew it without having any Scripture expressing to them the knowledge of this remedy, or of their Obligation to use it. Or that it was so necessary for the Salvation of their Children, whom they did believe to be in Original Sin, and by that debarred from Salvation, unless some remedy were applyed. Some remedy surely was as necessary for the Female, as Circumcision for the Male: Shew me this Remedy in Scripture. *Secondly*, they truly believed some of those Bloody Sacrifices to have been appointed unto them by God, for the Expiation of their Sins; but they could not truly believe that any of those Sacrifices could Expiate their Sins by its own Vertue: They believed then that those Sacrifices had this Expiative Vertue from the Merits of *Christ*: Shew me any Text in which this was then Written. It is ridiculous to say that this Faith was not necessary to that Church, at least so as to be believed by some among them. *Fourthly*, Mr. *Doctor*, you forget against whom you bring this Testimony: If it belongs only to the *Jews*; why do you bring it against Christians? If it belongs also to Christians; why do you not Circumcise your selves? You urge against us; *Ye shall not add*: We urge against you, *Ye shall not diminish*. *Fifthly*, Mr. *Doctor*, you forget that you are to conclude thus; *The whole* Canon *of Scripture is a sufficient direction for us*: And you conclude, that the *Law of* Moses *is a sufficient direction for us*; which you and yours confess to be false. *Sixthly*, You forget that a whole score of Books are diminished from the Canon by being quite lost; half a score more you will take from us, and cast amongst the *Apocrypha*. Do you think that no part of this sufficiency is wanting to such a Canon as you now have? Give me your Text for that. *Seventhly*, You forget that it is impossible for you to

prove,

prove, that the Scriptures must be taken either as they sound, or taken by every Man in that sense that he in his own Conscience Judges. Give us the Scriptures taken in the sense which the Visible Church Judges (*for the Judge of the sense must be Visible;*) and we will grant all. For then without any Addition, and by only true Interpretation, we will prove that we must take the Church for our Infallible Guide: And she will shew us Scripture rightly by Her Interpreted, for the admitting of unwritten Tradition. In the middle of this your sevenfold forgetfulness. I pray remember what pittiful Texts you have put in the Fore-front, to prove that, which, if not proved better, your Religion will prove most pittifully grounded. The sense of the Words which you urge is litterally this; Let no Man presume by his private Interpretations to deprave any Law, either by restraining, or stretching the Natural signification of the Words in which it is delivered. For Example; God in the 17. of *Deut. v.* 11, 12. saies; *Thou shalt not decline from the Sentence which they* (that is the High-Priests) *shall shew thee, to the Right-Hand nor to the left. And the Man that will do presumptuously, and will not hearken unto the Priest, even that Man shall dye.* God would not have this Law depraved by such an Interpretation as you use to give; that the Sentence is to be followed of those Judges which God appointed, to tell you what was Gods Law rightly understood, if they give Sentence according to Scripture; as you would have it expounded.

8. *Your fourth Text* out of the end of the *Revelations*, is incomparably weaker, and it evidently damns your Father *Luther*, and Lutheran Brethren unto Hell; For St. John *testifies to every Man that hears the Words of the Propheste of this Book* (he speaks of the *Revelations* only:) *If any Man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the Plagues which are written in this Book. And if any Man shall take away from the Words of the Book of this Propheste, God shall take his part out of the Book of Life, and out of the Holy City.*

But

But *Luther* took away *all the Words of the Book of this Propheſie*, when he ſaid in his firſt Preface to the New Teſtament, *that he received this Book neither for Prophetical nor Apoſtolical:* Therefore *God ſhall take his part out of the Book of Life, and out of the Holy City.* The ſame ſhall be done to his Lutheran Diſciples. Thus you ſee I have concluded evidently what I ſaid, let us hear you conclude; *Nothing muſt be added to this Book; therefore all the Scripture is ſufficient to decide all Controverſies;* tho' twenty whole Books of it be loſt, and tho' you take all the Texts of the whole Canon in that ſenſe which every Man in his Conſcience thinks beſt: Thus in effect you conclude. Note alſo that there is no kind of certainty, that the *Apocalyps* was the laſt Book of Scripture; for your own *Kemnitius* holds St. *John* his Goſpel Written after that; and moſt hold his *Epiſtles* the very laſt part of Scripture. Now mark, that the very laſt Verſes, which were Written in his laſt *Epiſtle* are, *I had many things to Write* (now when all the Scripture was Written:) *But I will not with Ink and Pen write unto thee. But I truſt I ſhall ſhortly ſee thee and we ſhall ſpeak Face to Face. Peace be to thee.* Now for Gods ſake, what Text aſſures you (for all other aſſurances we by your own Principles reject;) what Text (I ſay) aſſures you, that thoſe things which St. *John had yet to Write*, but did expreſs them by Mouth only, were all of them things unneceſſary.

9. *Your fifth Text*, Gal. 1. 8. *Tho' We or an Angel from Heaven Preach another Goſpel unto you then that which we have Preached unto you; let him be accurſed. As I ſaid before, ſo I ſay now again, if any Man Preach an other Goſpel unto you then that ye have received, let him be accurſed.* Firſt, Mr. *Doctor*, you forget, that in the begining and in other parts of your Book, you will have our Church to be one and the ſame with Yours in ſuch Fundamentals as conſtitute a Church: And will you now prove this Church, by the Sentence of the Apoſtle to have been accurſed, anathema-

tized, and Excommunicated, or cut off from the true Church? You muſt ſweat to find God a true Church upon Earth, if ours ſtood Excommunicated by St. *Paul* ever ſince it held Traditions. *Secondly*, You forget that you bring this Curſe upon your own Head, for it is you who Preach another Goſpel from that which St. *Paul* Preached, and that which we received from him, *To ſtand faſt and hold the Traditions which we had learned whether by Word or Epiſtle.* 2 Theſ. 2. 15. And ſure we are that the Epiſtles to the *Theſſalonians* did not contain the whole Ghoſpel: If they did, then find in thoſe Epiſtles, that you muſt take the Scripture only for your Rule in all points of Faith, and all other neceſſary points. It is alſo the Doctrine of St. *Paul*; *The things which thou haſt heard of me before many Witneſſes, the ſame commend thou unto Faithful Men, which ſhall be fit to teach others alſo.* 2 Tim. 2. 2. You will have us commend to other Men, not thoſe things which were only *heard before many Witneſſes* by publick Tradition, but only ſuch as are Written: You therefore gainſay St. *Paul*, and on you the Curſe of his Excommunication falls. Where you ſee, by the Way, a good Reaſon, why we could not hold you in our Communion, you being Anathematized by St. *Paul* himſelf. We then, conformably to the Doctrine of St. *Paul*, ſay that the Goſpel which he Preached unto them, and the Goſpel which they had received (ſee his firſt Epiſtle to them *cap.* 1. and 2.) was a Goſpel, which is moſt truely expounded by us to contain both his Unwritten and Written Doctrine: Yet in all probability very little of the Goſpel had been, as then, delivered in Writing unto the *Galatians*; or tell me how much, if you can? Sure I am, that beſides what was Written, they were yet to receive much more in Writing: Yea, the ſureſt Opinion is, that the firſt thing that ever St. *Paul* did Write, was the very Epiſtle to the *Galatians*, as is well proved by the *Romiſh* Teſtament in the Preface of the Epiſtle to the *Romans*. And you can bring nothing but conjectures to affirm

that

that he had delivered at this time any Written Goſpel at all unto them. Again, you moſt unskilfully ſay, *that this Text muſt be meant of the Written Goſpel only, for that which is Written bears* (you mean only) *the Name of Goſpel* For, firſt this very place proves the contrary: *Secondly*, many other places ſhew the contrary, for in St. *Matthew* c. 4. v. 23. *Jeſus went about all* Gallilee *Preaching the Goſpel:* What Goſpel was then Written? And *c.* 9. *v.* 35. *Jeſus went about all the Cities and Villages* Preaching *the Goſpel:* What Goſpel was then Written? Or Written when our Saviour ſaid; *whereſoever this Goſpel ſhall be* Preached, c. 26. v. 13. St. *Marc.* c. 1. v. 14. *Jeſus came into* Gallilee *Preaching the Goſpel of the Kingdom, ſaying, repent and believe the Goſpel.* What Written Goſpel did they know? Or, St. *Peter*, to whom in the tenth Chapter *Chriſt* ſpeaks about leaving goods *for the Goſpel.* And thus, I might run over the New Teſtament, where the Word *Goſpel* is ſo often taken for the Doctrine delivered by Word of Mouth; and perhaps not thrice in all Scripture it is clearly taken for the Written Goſpel. And alſo *to Evangelize* is far more frequently taken for Preaching the Unwritten Word, then the Written. This Text then moſt convincingly proves that St. *Paul* Commands them by no means to go againſt the Doctrine *received by Tradition.* As for St. *Auſtens* Authority, with which you back your Interpretation, *Bellarmine* told you truly, that he did not expound this Text, but did only cite it to prove that nothing was to be believed againſt Scripture: No, nor beſides Scripture Interpreted truly by the publick Authority of the Church; as I ſaid before: And this Anſwer ſatisfies what you bring out of St. *Jerome;* altho' indeed he ſpeaks of thoſe who bring not known and publick Tradition of the Church; but of thoſe who deviſe new things, and give them out for old Traditions: Which not being true Traditions delivered by the Church, muſt needs be of no Authority; without they can prove their Truth by Scripture, which they cannot prove by true Tradition.

10. It is therefore falſe which you ſay, that in the Judgement of St. *Auguſtin* and St. *Jerome*, it is enough to incurr the *Anathema*, if they teach any thing of Faith beſides that which is received from Scripture, in the ſenſe you take this Word, *Beſides*. It is alſo impoſſible to ſhew that St. *Paul* there ſpoke of Scripture. Yea he ſpeaks of that which they *had received from him*, who never Writ any thing before that Epiſtle, as I ſaid: Neither do we teach any thing of Faith *beſides* that which has Authority from the Scripture, tho' not from the Scripture expounded as private Men think fitteſt, but from Scripture rightly expounded by the Church, to which we add nothing but what Scripture bids us add. Wherefore the Authorities you cite, are ill applied to us, for we ſpeak nothing without Authority and Teſtimony of the Scripture taken in this manner, as it ſhould ever be; neither add we any thing what is not Written; For it is Written, *hold ye the Traditions*. If you ſay, this is no true Tradition. I am by Scripture bidden to hear the Church before you. Note, that it is a very good Argument to ſay, it is now here Written, therefore it is not to be admitted; if this Argument be only uſed as the Fathers uſe it, that is, when it was notorious that ſuch a thing was not delivered by Tradition: For what is not delivered by Church Tradition, muſt be proved by Scripture. See *S.* 12. *n.* 6. You ſee what little need we have to Interpret the Words, *beſides what I have Preached*, to be the ſame, as if he had ſaid, *contrary to what I Preached*. Yet becauſe this is very true, it is juſtified by *Bellarmine*: And you, not going about to Anſwer ſo much as one of the Proofs, deſerve no Anſwer. Yet mark what St *Paul* ſaies, *Rom.* 16. *I deſire you Brethren to mark them who make Diſſentions and Scandals* (note the next Word) *contrary to the Doctrine which you have Learned, and avoid them*. Who are contrary to what was delivered to the *Roman Church*, to which St. *Paul* did Write theſe Words? Who be they? Mark them: Avoid them.

11. You

11. Your ſixth Objection is no Text, but an Argument drawn from this Text, *To Mans Teſtament no one adds.* Gal. 3. 15. *Much leſs is it lawful to add to Gods Teſtament;* ſay you. We anſwer, that we add nothing to Gods Teſtament: But with all reaſon we ſtill ſtand to have it Interpreted, not by any mans private Authority. For what Common-wealth permits the Teſtaments and laſt Wills of Man to be ſo Interpreted? Let us have Gods Teſtament both New and Old, Interpreted by that publick Authority Impowered by Gods Commiſſion to this end, and we require no more. Leſs then this cannot in reaſon be required: So that your Jeſt of a will partly written partly nuncupatory is loſt. No wills worſe made then thoſe which concern many Intricat matters belonging to very ſeveral Perſons, and yet prohibiting any Court in the World to interpret them, but do let the ſenſe be judged by every one concerned in it. In ſo much that tho' *Chriſt*, in four ſeveral places of his Will, clearly tells us that, he leaves us the uneſteemable Legacy of his precious Body and Blood; and that his Fleſh is truely Meat, &c. Yet by private Interpretations it ſhall be lawfull to tell us, that we muſt have only a Figure and Sign of his Body. Would any Man admit of the Figure or Picture of a Horſe or Houſe, in place of a Horſe or Houſe given him by Legacy? Shall there be no Court in the World to prevent theſe inconveniencies; Thus you would have Chriſt make his Teſtament. Who has ſo little diſcourſe as to think a Teſtament, left to no Courts Interpretation in the World, to be a fit Judge, by its own evidence, when twenty, or thirty leaves can be proved to be miſſing unto it? And yet to the whole Teſtament, New and Old, twenty whole Books be miſſing, as I have proved *Sect.* 1. *n.* 7. and half a ſcore more be moſt unjuſtlie pulled out of the Canon by you, and caſt among the Apocrypha, And yet you would have all us ſtake our Souls upon the full aſſurance we have that this broken Teſtament taken thus, and alſo taken as it is expounded by you, againſt Fathers,

Councils, and the conſtant Judgement of the greater ſort of the preſent Chriſtian World, and the known Judgment of all the Chriſtian World for a thouſand years together? What more unreaſonable. *With Mans Teſtament none deals thus, much leſs with Gods.*

12. I muſt needs alſo put you in mind, that you are much miſtaken when you ſay that the Word *Teſtament* ſignifies only a Written Teſtament: For our Saviour in his laſt Supper ſaies, *This the Blood of the New Teſtament*, *Math.* 26. 28. *Mark* 14. 24. and again, *this Cup is the New Teſtament in my Blood which (Cup) is ſhed for you.* Here we have the New Teſtament made by unwritten words eight years before one word of it was written, and well towards eightie years before all of it was written to the end. Having then ſhewed that the Words *Goſpel and New Teſtament* according to Scripture, do moſt properly ſignifie the unwritten Word of *Chriſt*: We may confidentlie ſay, that we add nothing to the *Goſpel of Chriſt*, or New Teſtament: If you ask, how I know what was delivered by Chriſts unwritten Goſpel and Nevv Teſtament? I eaſily anſvver; *I know* this by the Teſtimonie of the ſelf ſame alwaies viſible Church, by whoſe Teſtimony you know that ſuch Books contain Chriſts written Goſpel, and written new Teſtament. *I know this by* the Tradition of the ſame Church, by which onlie all Chriſtians did know it, for thoſe ſeventy or eighty Years, which paſſed between the Paſſion of Chriſt and the finiſhing his written Goſpel or *New Teſtament*. *I know this by* a better Teſtimony then all the World knew the Articles neceſſary to Salvation before any one *word of Scripture was written*, which time contains above two thouſand years: For if the Tradition of that Church in the Law of Nature, were ſufficient to ground the infallible aſſurance of all the Articles believed by that Church, for two thouſand Years; I hope the Tradition of the Church, which is now in the Law of Grace, is yet a more ſtrong ground to aſſure me of that unwtitten Doctrine of Chriſt delivered far more

more publicklie by him and his Apoſtles, then that unwritten Word of GOD was delivered in the Law of Nature to ſome few Patriachs, in a manner very private in compariſon of CHRISTS unwritten Doctrine; as ſhall be ſaid *Sect*: 16. *n.* 2.

13. *Your ſixth and laſt Text* here objected is our Saviours ſpeech *Matth.* 15. taken from *Iſa.* 29. 13. *Their fear towards me is taught by the Precepts of Men.* Whence you infer *that all things of Worſhip or Faith neceſſary to Salvation which are not commanded or written, are to be condemned.* Before I return anſwer, give me leave to tell you whoſe Language you ſpeak when you deliver this your own Doctrine. St. *Auſten (contra Maximum l.* 1.) Brings in this *Arian* Heretick ſpeaking thus to the Catholicks. *If you bring any thing from the Scripture, it is neceſſary that we hear it: But theſe words which be beſides Scripture, are in noc aſe received of us, ſeeing our Lord does admoniſh us ſaying, in vain they Worſhip me teaching the Commandements of Men.* So that Heretick. Juſt ſo you and yours. I anſwer firſt that many things may be commanded by God and yet not written, and ſo be Precepts not of Men, but of GOD, tho' we be aſſured of them by Men. For all Precepts which were for thoſe two thouſand Years and more, concerning Worſhip or Faith, neceſſary in thoſe Ages to Salvation, before the firſt Scriptures were Written, were truly the Precepts and Doctrine of GOD, and as ſuch to be obſerved; tho' this Obligation was Notified only by the Men of that Church. For Example, the fall of *Adam*, and the Promiſe made of our future Redemption, was Notified by *Adams* Children, who delivered the ſame to their Children, and ſo downwards. So we read *Gen*, 9. *That GOD ſaid to* Noah *and his Sons, that it was* not permitted to them to Eat Blood *v.* 4. This Precept was oblidging all the World upon the credit of the Tradition of ſo few. So likewiſe we read in the 17. of *Geneſis*, that *when* Abraham *was nintie years old and nine, the Lord appeared unto him and made a Covenant with him and his Seed*, to make him the Father of the Faithfull

full, to bleſs all his Seed: And then he gave him, and all his Poſterity, a moſt ſtrick Precept of Circumciſion. All this *Abraham* onlie Notified to his Poſteritie: They all believed this Promiſe and Covenant of God, and they all ſtrictlie obſerved this Precept of Circumciſion: And yet neither this Precept, nor this Covenant, were written for thoſe four hundred years and more which paſſed between the time of *Abraham* and *Moſes*, the firſt Scripture Writter. Was that unwritten Covenant the Doctrine of Man? Was Circumſion the Precept of Man? No. Was the Precept of not Eating Blood the Precept of Man? And yet by Tradition it had all its force, even from *Noah* to *Chriſts* time, among the *Gentiles*, and untill the times of *Moſes* among the Jews. Well then, why ſhould the unwritten Doctrine and Precepts of Chriſt, and his Apoſtles, be called the Doctrine and Precepts of Men? You can ſay nothing, but that the Teſtimonie of Men is not ſufficient ground for us to hold this Doctrine, and theſe Precepts to be Divine or Apoſtolical; which is apparentlie falſe: For the Men of the Church of Chriſt, and the ſupreme Paſtors and Governours thereof, cannot be of leſs credit and Authoritie, then were the Men of the Law of Nature, or of the Seed of *Abraham*, or the Teſtimonie of *Noah* and his Sons. Their Teſtimonie could, and did ſuffice to make their Doctrine, and Precepts, delivered by God in a far more private manner, to be notwithſtanding prudentlie believed, and imbraced for Divine. Why then ſhould not the Teſtimonie of the Church ſuffice to make the unwritten Doctrine of *Chriſt* and his Apoſtles to be held for Divine? It is therefore no kind of proof to ſay; *Chriſt reprehends humane Doctrines and Precepts, therefore we muſt not imbrace Divine Doctrines and Precepts meerly becauſe they are not written.* You embrace the Doctrine of Men, who tell us this Doctrine of yours; which is neither written nor delivered by Univerſal Tradition. Again, were not all the Precepts and Doctrines of Chriſt believed as Divine for thoſe fourſcore years or there about,

bouts, before the whole Canon of the Scripture was finiſhed? Of all theſe Traditions ſee my *Sect.* 16. *n.* 1. 2. and the whole 19. *Sect.* Secondlie, I pray how do you avoid the imbracing Doctrine of Men, who hold the Churches Authoritie to be meer humane: And yet meerlie upon her Authoritie you receive ſuch and ſuch Copies to be the true Copies of the true Original Word of God: See *Sect.* 4. *n.* 3, 4. *&c.* Yea, upon the meer weak Teſtimonie of your own private Tranſlaturs, all you (who are not exceeding skilful in Greek) take your *Engliſh Bible* for the Word of God; and again, upon the meer weak authoritie of your Miniſters, you take that interpretation for true which they tell you to be ſo; tho' you cannot know it to be ſo, for want of skill in Languages, and for want of skill in conferring places, and for want of abilitie to uſe thoſe twentie Rules which your own Doctors hold neceſſary for the knowing aſſuredlie the true ſenſe of God. Thus I might ſhew you how in all thoſe twentie four neceſſary points (which I have hitherto ſhewed not contained in any part of the written Word of God) you hold truly and properly the Doctrine and precepts of men, whom you believe to have meerly humane authority. Thus you proceed as the Jews and Phariſees did, not relying only upon the Traditions they had from *Moſes*: (for example, concerning the remedy againſt original ſin appliable to femal Children:) but relying upon Tradition deviſed by ſome ill Interpreters of their Law; by *Sammai*, by *Killel*, by *Achiba* and ſuch other Rabbins: as St. *Jerome* teaches in ſeveral places.

14. Whereas you add, that our Traditions are to be challenged of contrariety to the Scripture, for the moſt part you proceed in your uſuall manner to ſay boldy, what is for your turn, but never turn your hand or finger to prove it, *Mr. Doctor*, I will undertake to make good at any time, that there is incomparable more difficultie to ſhew that one part of the written Word is not contrary to ſome other, then to ſhew that any one of our Traditions be far from the leaſt

contrariety to the Word of God: See *Sect.* 23. *n.* 6. All Schollars know I ſpeak in this point that which is evident. Thus I have anſwered your whole 23. *Sect.*

15. I have now a Word of great importance to ſay to you and yours. You affirm the Scripture alone to be neceſſarily admitted by us, as our ſole and only Judge. In this, your part is affirmative, and ſo you muſt prove what you ſay. In this you contradict all Viſible *Catholick Churches* which were in the World at your Reformation: Againſt ſo publick Authority, evidence of Scripture muſt be brought; or elſe you do moſt injuriouſly oppoſe ſo publick an Authority, according to your own Principles, *Thirdly*, in this you deliver a point, which (if true) is no leſs neceſſary then the true choice of the only Rule directing to true Faith; therefore according to your own Principles, this point muſt be clearly contained in Scripture, in which you ſay all neceſſary points are clearly contained. But, we have now at large heard every Text you thought fit to bring for a thing of ſo great concernment; the anſwers given to every one ſhew clearly, not any one of them to contain that point clearly: Whence I conclude, that what in ſuch kind of matters cannot be proved by clear Texts, muſt not be believed, according to your own Principles; therefore, even according to them, we are not to believe that Scripture is by it ſelf alone our ſole and only Rule of Faith, or that it clearly contains the plain Deciſion of all neceſſary Controverſies; which it muſt *do to* be our Judge in them *all*. Remember Mr. *Doctor*, how you *Sect.* 13. tell the Antiprelatical Party, *that they are bound to bring plain and expreſs Scripture to demonſtrate that Epiſcopacy is Unlawful. It were well, more Authority were yielded to Tradition of the Churches of God.* And Sect. 14. *we thence received Biſhops, whence we received the Chriſtian Faith.* So you. Say ſo of all you received, and I need ſay no more.

SECT.

SECTION XI.

A FIFTEENTH ARGUMENT.

Altho' Scripture only ſhould be our Judge, yet this Judge would decide many points clearly againſt you.

YOu cannot but give me leave to call that clearly decided againſt you by Scripture, for which I can bring, at the leaſt, as clear Texts, as you bring for the Deciſion of many neceſſary points, which you hold (by Reaſon of ſuch Texts) to be clearly decided by Scripture, as you ſay all points are, which be neceſſary to Salvation. Therefore, if I can bring as clear Texts for ſome points of our Faith, oppoſite to yours, as you can bring for thoſe fourteen neceſſary points of which I treated in my ſecond Section; and as clear as you can bring for your belief of thoſe divers points ſpecified in my eight Sect. in which I have particularly examined all your chief Texts for Baptizing Children: If I alſo can bring as clear Texts as you could bring in my ninth Section, for the Lawfulneſs of Working on Saturdaies, and Unlawfulneſs of Working on Sundaies; or as you could bring in the precedent Section to prove that the Scripture contains, and clearly decides all neceſſary Controverſies: If I can do all this, then theſe Texts of mine cannot but be allowed by you to be indeed clear becauſe *you ſay*, you can bring clear Texts for all points neceſſary (as all the above mentioned points be;) but I will ſhew that the Texts that I ſhall here bring, for ſome prime points in which we believe contrary to *you*, be at the leaſt as clear as any of thoſe Texts brought by you, and affirmed by you to be very ſufficiently clear. Wherefore my Texts, being

as clear as thoſe which are acknowledged to be ſufficiently clear, muſt alſo be acknowledged to be ſufficiently clear. Now then to my Texts.

2. What importes more a dying Chriſtian, then to have his Sin forgiven him; and that upon the Word of God? And yet you cry, *Superſtition, Superſtition, if a Prieſt be called to Pray over him, and to anoint him with Oyl, to procure forgiveneſs of his Sins.* But what ſaies your own Bible? *Is any Man Sick among you, let him call for the Elders* (the Prieſts) *of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with Oyl in the Name of the Lord, and the Prayer of the Faithfull ſhall ſave the Sick. And the Lord ſhall raiſe him up, and if he hath committed Sins they ſhall be forgiven him.* James 5. 14. Have you among all the Texts which you cited, and I examined in the laſt Section, any one Text but half ſo clear for what you intended to prove, as this Text is, to prove *Extreme-Unction* to forgive Sins; and conſequently to be a Sacrament, or Viſible ſign (ſuch an one as the Act of Anointing is) of Inviſible Grace conferred thereby to forgive his Sins, for (ſaies the Text) *if he be in Sins, they ſhall be forgiven him.* If you have but any one Text, half ſo clear for that prime Fundamental Point of yours, I pray bring it forth now whilſt that and the anſwer to that is in freſh memory, That anſwer will tell you what I have to ſay againſt any ſuch Text: Let us ſee what you can ſay againſt this Text? Some anſwer, that it relates to the Gift of healing in thoſe Daies; which ſhift is directly againſt the Words of the Text, ſaying, *if he has committed Sins, they ſhall be forgiven.* Again, what Scripture have you to prove, that the Elders in the Daies of St. *James* Cured all infirm Men with anointing them with Oyl? *Laſtly*, I am moſt earneſt to know by what clearer Text then this, you were forced to forſake the practiſe of this Sacrament uſed by all *Catholick* Churches upon Earth, when you caſt it off as Superſtitious; Where is, I pray, your ſo much boaſted-of Evidence of Scripture againſt

ſo

ſo publick Authority? Mr. *Doctor*, remember your own Words, cited in the end of my laſt Section. Remember that you *Sect.* 43. ſay that *the Univerſal practiſe of the Church is the beſt Interpreter of Scripture, where there is no plain Text* (as he there is not) *to take away all gain-ſaying.*

3. When a little after your firſt Reformation, you (contrary to all the Churches both of Eaſt and Weſt) denied the *Real Preſence* of *Chriſt* in the Sacrament; by what clearer Text could you evidently Demonſtrate, that thoſe following Texts could not be truely Interpreted of a *Real Preſence*? *This is my Body: The Bread which I will give is my Fleſh; my Fleſh is Meat indeed, my Blood is Drink indeed:* In ſo much as *he who Eateth or Drinketh unworthily is Guilty of the Body and Blood of our Lord. This is the Cup of the New Teſtament, which Cup* (as is evident by the Greek Text where the gender agrees only with the Cup) *ſhall be ſhed for you:* That then in the *Cup* was the very ſame Blood which was ſhed. Give me as clear Texts as theſe are, to prove, that one Man may not at the ſame time have two Wives, or that he may Labour on the Saturday, but not on the Sunday, &c?

4. Again, when you denied the Prieſts of the Church to have Power to forgive Sins, contradicting alſo herein all the Catholick Churches upon the Earth; what clearer Text did you bring againſt them all, to prove that they falſely Interpreted to their purpoſe this Text: *He breathed upon them, and ſaid, whoſe Sins ſoever yee ſhall remit, they are remitted: And whoſe Sins ſoever yee ſhall retain, they are retained, Jo.* 20. 22. Againſt publick Authority you ſhould bring evident Demonſtration of Scripture, according to your own Principles: We now moſt earneſtly call for this evidence in the three Sacraments here mentioned by me. We call at leaſt, for clearer places then theſe be, in caſe you ſay, theſe be not clear enough to Decide the Controverſie for us. And we call for ſuch places, to Decide all thoſe four and twenty ne-

neceſſary points which I have mentioned: Which being neceſſary, muſt be ſhewed to be Decided rightly by clear Scripture; and conſequently by clearer Texts then any of theſe are; in caſe you deny theſe to be ſufficiently clear: Give us thoſe clearer Texts, and we will confeſs our ſelves ſilenced. If you cannot do this; this little will ſerve to ſilence you.

SECTION XII.

A SIXTEENTH ARGUMENT.

That the Holy Fathers never allowed the Scripture for the only Rule of Faith.

1. IT is moſt unreaſonable to ſay, that the greateſt Doctors of the primitive Church did not know the only Rule of Faith: For this point importing above all points, the Apoſtles muſt needs (had it been ſo) have imprinted it deeply in the minds of all they inſtructed; and all their Diſciples would have done the like to their Diſciples: So that many of the Church, eſpecially the moſt Learned of the whole Church, would not be Ignorant of this point: At leaſt I am ſure, that you may ſooner now be preſumed Ignorant of the only true Rule of Faith; then they then.

2. Firſt then, had the Holy Fathers ever allowed of the Scripture for the only Rule of Faith, they neither would, nor could have held any Men Hereticks for holding that which was contrary to no clear Scripture: But they did hold many ſuch to be Hereticks, as I have ſhewed *Sect.* 8. where I ſhewed, that St. *Auſten* did hold on the one ſide, that Baptiſm of Children could not be proved by clear Scripture; and yet he, in and with the *Milevetan* Council condemned thoſe for Hereticks

ticks who did deny the neceſſity of Baptiſm for Children. See *Sect.* 7. *n.* 3. 8 *n* 3. 4. 5. There alſo *n.* 6. He and *Vincentius Lyrinenſis* accounts them Hereticks who held Rebaptization neceſſary to all Baptized by Hereticks: And yet he held on the other ſide, that this point could not be cleared out of only Scripture; ſee them *n.* 7. In the next numbet I did ſhew how Antiquity held alſo the *Quarta-decimani* for Hereticks, tho' the believing *Eaſter* ought to be always kept on the fourteenth day of the Moon be not againſt clear Scripture. There alſo I ſhewed out of St. *Epiphanius* and alſo St. *Auſtin* (who expreſly in the begining of his Catalogue profeſſes to put down none but ſuch as are true Hereticks) that *Aerius* was held by Antiquity for an Heretick, *becauſe he denyed Prayer for the Dead, and held that there was no Faſting dayes of precept*: In which points, I am ſure you will ſay that this *Aerius* held nothing contrary to Scripture. There alſo I ſhewed out of St. *Epiphanius* and St. *Auſten*, that the *Antidicomarites or Helvidians* were held Hereticks by Antiquity, for denying that our *Lady* after the Birth of our Saviour did ever live a *Virgin*: Which point is not clear in Scripture. Therefore all thoſe were Hereticks, not for contradicting Scripture; yet they were Hereticks for contradicting ſome Rule of Faith: Therefore there is ſome other Rule of Faith beſides Scripture; and conſequently Scripture alone is not the only Rule of Faith.

3. *Secondly*, it was by Holy Fathers noted to be peculiar to Hereticks to ſtand to Scripture only, and to refuſe all other Rules: *So the* Macedonians *and* Eunomians, *haveing no regard of what was taught to the contrary by the multitude and Antiquity of Chriſtians, denyed the Holy Ghoſt to be Glorified with the Father and the Son; becauſe the Scripture did no where expreſly ſay this.* St. *Baſil. de Sp. San. c.* 25. and *L.* 1. *contra Eunom:* So the *Pelagians* (in St. *Auſten de Natura & Gratia c.* 39.) were uſed to ſay; *Let us believe that which we read, but let us believe it to be a wickedneſs*

edneſs to believe that which we do not read. So St. *Auſtin* *L.* 1. againſt *Maximinus* the Arian Biſhop brings him in ſaying: *If thou bring forth any thing from thoſe Divine Scriptures which are common to us both, we muſt needs hear thee. But thoſe ſpeeches which are not in Scripture, be, by no means, received by us, ſeeing that our Lord admoniſhes us and ſaies without cauſe they worſhip me Teaching the Commandements and precepts of Men.* So he. And juſt ſo you, as is clear by your Objection in the laſt Section but one before this, *Num.* 13. and again, *I wiſh to be the Diſciple of Divine Scriptures.* Wherefore the Council of *Sens*, in the ſeventh Age Decreed (*Decreto* 5.) *This it was a dangerous thing to be in that Error, that nothing is to be admitted which is not drawn from Scripture. For many things are derived by* Chriſt *from the Hands of the Apoſtles, from Mouth to Mouth,* &c. *which are to be holden without all doubt.* See *Sect.* 20.

4. *Thirdly*, the Holy Fathers expreſly refuſe to diſpute out of Scriptures only, upon this very cauſe, that they do not ſuffice to end and decide all Controverſies. So the moſt Ancient *Tertullian* ſpeaks firſt in general of never Diſputing with Hereticks out of Scripture only, *c.* 17. *Becauſe this Scripture-combat avails to nothing; but to the making either ones Stomach, or ones Brains to turn. Lib. de præſ.* C. 17. And by and by he in particular ſaies of the *Gnoſticks*, that which we may ſay of our Adverſaries. *This Hereſy does not receive ſome Scriptures;* (you put ten Books among the *Apocripha*) *ſome Scriptures they receive with Additions and Detractions ordered to their turn:* (ſee what I ſaid of your Tranſlations, *Sect.* 5. *and thoſe Scriptures they receive in any manner intirely they turn to their turn by new deviſed Expoſition* (ſee how you do this, *Sect.* 7.) Then he concludes generally: *We muſt not therefore appeal to Scriptures, nor in our Combat rely upon them, in which either no Victory is to be obtained, or a very uncertain one.* Which how true it is, you may ſee in my Scripture-Diſputation about the keeping of Sunday, *Sect.* 9.

9. where I gave you Text for Text, as good as you brought or could bring. Thus the *Anabaptiſts* do not only weary you out, and ſhew you to the very Eye; that, ſtanding to Scripture alone, they are invincible by you: But alſo they ſometimes force your prime Doctors to leave their ſtanding on Scripture only, and force them to fly to Tradition. See Dr. *Taylors* plain Confeſſion hereof, *Sect.* 1. *n.* 4. And your great *Beza* found this inſiſting upon Scripture only to breed ſuch endleſs jarring, that in his laſt Book but one, *he profeſſes himſelf to be weary of ſuch Combates and Encounters, becauſe he finds Controverſies thereby made but brawles; and therefore wiſhes, that in ſome common Aſſembly of Churches all theſe ſtrives at once were Decided.* The evidence of this point made your Learned *Sutcliffe*, in his review, *P.* 42. to ſay, *it is falſe that we will admit of no Judge but Scripture; for we appeal ſtill to a Lawful General Council.* But here I would ask, how we can reſt upon the Sentence given by a General Council, if that be not Infallible; for ſtill every Man muſt be calling this Sentence to review made by his own weak Judgement: As has been fully Declared, *Sect.* 1. *n.* 1. 2, 3, 4.

5. Some of our Adverſaries think to ſhift off the Authority of *Tertullian*, as if it were delivered againſt thoſe only, who rejected great part of the Scriptures, and corrupted other parts; which, ſay they, we do not. I anſwer, that of your like proceedings I have ſpoken enough in the places I cited, jointly with *Tertullians* Words: But this your ſhift is clearly undone by *Tertullians* own Words following, *c.* 45. *We now hitherto have in general* (mark this Word) *treated againſt all Hereſies, repelling them* (all) *upon certain juſt and neceſſary exceptions from conferring out of Scriptures.* So he. Yea, the very driſt of a great part of this his little Book is, independently of all Scripture, to confute all Hereticks, by proving that true Believers muſt be able to ſhew by Tradition, the Deſcent of their Doctrine from the Apoſtles. *But*

if indeed Truth ſtands for us, (ſaies he, c. 37.) *whoſoever we be who walk in that Rule which the* Church *has received from* Chriſt, Chriſt *from* God, *we proceed manifeſtly in our intent, defining, that Hereticks ought not to be admitted to make their appeal to Scriptures whom we do prove without the Scriptures, not to have any right to the Scriptures.* Note here firſt, that he ſpeaks, of ſuch *as would appeal to Scripture;* therefore they did receive them; Note ſecondly, *that without Scriptures Tertullian* promiſſes himſelf the ſureſt Victory, by forcing them to ſhew their Viſible Succeſſion, and to ſhew their Doctrine delivered from Hand to Hand by Tradition, or Word of Mouth; as that Word was *which the Apoſtles received from* Chriſt, *and* Chriſt *from* God. By *this Rule he* would have us *all walk.*

6. Our Adverſaries uſe to alledge ſome paſſages of Fathers appealing in their Diſputes againſt Hereticks unto the Scriptures, chiefly St. *Auſten*, who Diſputing againſt the *Donatiſts*, conceived himſelf to have moſt manifeſt Texts to prove againſt them, that Chriſts true Church could never grow ſo low, as to be Viſible only in part of *Africa;* the Viſibility of Chriſts Church through the World being manifeſt in Scripture, as he ſaies, *de Unitate Eccleſiæ*, c. 7. 11. 15. & 17. But it is no good Argument, to ſay, The Fathers appealed to the Scriptures in ſome few points, in which they knew they had manifeſt advantages; therefore they approved appealing to Scripture only in any kind of Controverſie: So it is no Argument, to ſay, the Fathers did exact Written Texts of Scripture in Proof of ſome Heretical Novelties; and profeſſed they would not give Ear to ſuch Novelties without Written Texts: Therefore we muſt not admit of any, though never ſo Ancient, belief of the whole Church, delivered by Tradition from the Apoſtles, without ſome clear Written Text can be alledged for it. This is no conſequence; for in points which are known not to be delivered by Tradition, yea not ſo much as pretending to it, is a good Argument to

ſay;

ſay; give me a clear Text for this, or elſe with the ſame Facility that you affirm it, I will deny it: As I ſaid, *Sect.*10. *n* 9, 10. Do but note what I ſaid there, and then join it to theſe places; and all places alledgable out of the Fathers will eaſily be ſolved.

7. All thoſe Fathers which might be alledged (and part of them is alledged, *Sect.*8.) for holding Traditions in points neceſſary to Salvation, no where expreſſed in Scripture; as alſo all thoſe who hold the Authority of the Church by it ſelf to ſuffice to ground our Faith, and to determine all our Controverſies, (whom we ſhall cite, *Sect.* 21.) all theſe I ſay, clearly hold that Scripture is not the only Rule, Guide, and Direction, of all that is neceſſary to be believed, or done by us for obtaining Salvation.

THE THIRD QUESTION.

Whether the Church *be the Judge appointed by God, to end all our Controverſies? With a Word of the* Socinians, *concerning Reaſons being our Judge.*

1. SOme Men may perhaps wonder why, in ſo ſhort a Work, I ſhould be ſo long in proving the Scripture not to be by it ſelf alone, our only Rule, or Direction of Faith; but thoſe who are underſtanding Schollars will eaſily ſee, how, after the Proof of that point, I have in a manner diſpatch'd all this buſineſs: Becauſe all Sectaries, making their ſtanding to the ſole Judgement of Scripture, to be the only Foundation of all and every one of their ſo ſeveral Sects; when now this Foundation is ſhewed not to ſerve the end they intend, but that we muſt yet have a Judge giving us Infallible aſſurance of many neceſſary Verities, of which the Scripture alone does not aſſure us: Hence follows manifeſtly the utter over-throw of all theſe and all other imaginable Sects, by the apparent neceſſity of holding the true Church of CHRIST to be this Judge; ſhe only being the Judge, to which we are ſent by Scripture it ſelf, with an Obligation of our being held for Publicans or Heathens unleſs we hear Her. Neither is there any kind of probability now left, of finding any other Judge ſufficient to direct us in all things neceſ-

ceſſary to Salvation, and to end all our Controverſies, and ſufficient to contain us all in Unity of one interior Faith, and exterior Profeſſion of the ſame, with all other conditions requiſite in our Judge.

2. Humane Reaſon, ſo adored by the *Socinians*, cannot be this Judge; *Firſt*, becauſe Fallible: But with this they eaſily diſpenſe, denying any Faith to be Infallible. *Secondly*, no one Pariſh in the World was ever yet known to be of this their Opinion; is it then likely to be true in the Eyes of any Rational Man? What wit is there in thinking to be Wiſer then all wits? What Reaſon to make Reaſon Judge in things known to ſurpaſs Reaſon? *Thirdly*, Does not Reaſon perſwade any Man to think that it is fitter for him to ſubmit to the Authority of all the Chriſtians of all Ages, and places, who ever had any thing like a Church, then to adhear to a few ſcattered ſelf-conceited People, pretending to find out a Wiſer ground of Religion, then ever was acknowledged by any kind of People in the World, who had the ſhape of an Univerſal and perpetual Church? Of which more, *Sect.* 14. *Fourthly*, How Imprudently did the Apoſtle exhort all, *Idem ſapere, to be of one Opinion, to keep Unity in Faith, to ſpeak one thing, to be perfect in one ſenſe, and one Judgement*, 1 *Cor.* 1. & 2 *Cor.* 13. If he knew it were Gods Will that every one ſhould follow his own Judgment, which every one has as different almoſt from another, as their Faces are? *Fifthly*, What an improportionable means is this to keep that Unity in Faith? And to *adhear to what has been Evangelized or delivered unto us, tho' an Angel ſhould come to perſwade the contrary.* For, let but an abler Man then my ſelf come, and ſhew me, that I have not ſo good Reaſon for what I believe, as he has, and as he (if we ſtand only to Reaſon, without reſpect to Authority) can bring to the contrary; I muſt (*ſay they*) follow what he propoſes: So that weak Men muſt be Weather-Cocks. *Sixthly*, Is it not all Reaſon, that what convincing motives make evidently credible to be revealed by God,

God, that I ſhould Credit that not as the Word of Man, but receive it as the Word of God; as truly it is; and ſo rely upon it as ſtrongly as is fit to rely on the Word of God? *Seventhly*, According to this unreaſonable Ground, there muſt be allowed, all the World over, as great Variety of believing, more or leſs, as there is of Underſtanding, more or leſs: And as great Contrariety of belief muſt be Lawful, as there is Contrariety in the Judgments of one to another, and of the ſame Man in different occaſions. Can any Creature who is but like a Rational Man, believe that the World was taught to proceed ſo by Chriſt, and his Apoſtles; or that the World did ever proceed ſo in any one Age? What Record Teſtifies any ſuch thing? Is this to *bring into Captivity all Underſtanding to the Obedience of* Chriſt? 2 *Cor.* 10. 5. If this wild Liberty be called Captivity; I am ſure that, by as good a Figure, you *Socinians* (who call your ſelves Rational Men,) may as truly be called the moſt Irrational of all Chriſtian Men. You needs muſt pardon me if I Judge ſo, for your own Principle of following, what my own Reaſon tells me, makes me moſt really to think ſo, after mature conſideration of the matter.

SECTION XIII.

It is declared what we underſtand when we ſeek whether the Church *is to be our Judge, or no?*

1. IT muſt ſtill be carried in our minds, that we are in the ſearch of the Judge appointed us by *Chriſt*; and conſequently we muſt proceed as Men do, who firſt ſeek after a general knowledge in groſs, and then deſcend to particulars. So firſt we ſearched whether God had given us any Judge; then

then finding that he has given us ſome infallible direction, we did ſee whether this were given ſufficiently in any one Book of Scripture, or in any particular number of Books, or in the whole Canon taken together. But we, not finding as yet what we ſought, we caſt an Eye upon Natural Reaſon, which if it were to be followed by us as our Judge, this very Judge of ours (that is our own Reaſon) told us ſhe neither was, nor appeared like to that Judge we ſought for, ſhe being a Judge not ending, but endleſly raiſing doubts in all points: Still therefore we are in our general ſearch. And we have only in groſs got a hint of finding ſome Infallible means, to guide us ſecurely in all our doubts, in that Bleſſed Congregation of People which followed the inſtructions of *Chriſt*, and his Diſciples, ſtill propagating the Doctrine delivered to them from Age to Age untill we come to our Age. Here, or no where, this infallible direction is to be had. But by what particular way this Congregation is to Communicate, and impart this direction unto us, is not the thing we now ſeek at the firſt; but it is the very laſt thing we can ſeek for. For that being found, we are to follow that particular means, and by no means to ſtray one foot from it. We muſt ſeek that we may find; and after we have once found what we ſought for, we muſt ſtand ſtill firmly fixed in the Faith we have found. Becauſe by what we have found we are alſo taught to believe this particular, that we are to reſt free from further enquiry; Becauſe our God would not have us follow any other Judges then he appoints: Therefore he would have us ſeek after no other; but believe that no other was to be ſought after; leaſt ſo we ſhould be alwayes Seekers and never be Believers: As *Tertullian* diſcourſes admirably, C. 7. *de præſcript.*

2. We do not therefore as yet ſearch whether this particular means of directing us, be by the Decrees of the Chief Paſtor of this Church; or by the Councils held without him, or held by him, and defining together with him; for this ſearch is yet a further Work; tho' it be a Work ſoon diſpatched, for as much as

as concerns our purpoſe, after that we have once aſſuredly found out that this infallible means is to be found in this Bleſſed Congragation inſtituted by his Diſciples, and their followers with a viſible Succeſſion in all Ages from *Chriſts* Age to this. Now then, this one thing we ſearch. For, is, whether this Bleſſed Congregation (which we always underſtand here, when we name the Church, as long as we ſpeak of ſearching our Guide or Judge in a more general manner) has not ſome means or other appointed by God, by which ſhe can infallibly guide us to the knowledge of the true Faith? When we have found that ſhe has ſome ſuch means; we ſhall readily paſs on further, to ſee what means this is. Now let us be ſure not to entangle our ſelves with that further Search, or any thing belonging to it, untill we have fully ſatisfied our ſelves of this general Verity, *that this Bleſſed Congregation has in it ſome means appointed by God, to direct all to the knowledge of the only true Faith.* Neither yet do we begin to ſearch, whether this Congregation, inſtituted thus by *Chriſt*, and ſtill viſibly continuing in his Doctrine, be the Chuch of *Rome*, or the *Proteſtant* Church, or both theſe, or any other beſides theſe, of which hereafter: But that one thing for which now we only ſearch is, whether this Congregation (whereſoever it is) has not ſome infallible means appointed by God, to be followed by all, that all may come to be ſaved in it?

3. And we moſt groundedly ſay, that this Church (ſtill meaning, by this name, the Congregation we ſpeak of) is our infallible Judge: And conſequently, this Church has ſome infallible means to guide all to the Truth in all points of Faith, tho' not expreſly contained in Scriptures, and to decide all our Controverſies in Religion: For which I ſhall give my Reaſons in the enſuing Section. But before I begin it, I note in a Word; that this Church, having ſome infallible means appointed by God to direct us in the only true Faith, (without which Faith Eternal Salvation cannot be had) it muſt be a Damnable Sin not to take pains, in a tollerable manner, to find

find it out; and to imbrace it, when we have found it: For otherwiſe we ſhould neglect the Execution of what God has appointed us to do, in a matter neceſſary to our Salvation; and we ſhould alſo Sin againſt that Charity, which every one owes to his own Soul, if, having means offered us, to be infallibly guided in the choice of that Faith neceſſary to Salvation, we ſhould neither take ordinary pains to find it, nor to follow it, when we had found it. This Leſſon is ſo very neceſſary to many thouſands, that it deſerves to be a thouſand times over inculcated unto them.

SECT. XIV.

It is proved out of the Old Teſtament that the Church is our Infallible Judge in all Controverſies of Faith.

1. FOr more then two thouſand Years, before any Word of the Old Teſtament was Written, Gods Church had ſome Infallible way to end all Controverſies; for all that time there was no Scripture, and yet there were many points then neceſſary to be believed, in which Men of various Judgments might vary in their Judgments: For example, about the believe of reward, and puniſhment of the Life to come; about the immortallity of the Soul; about the fall of *Adam*; the promiſe of a Redeemer; and afterwards of this Redeemers being to be the Son of *Abraham*; about the neceſſity of the Circumciſion given unto him, &c. The Church of that time was the only Judge of all theſe, and ſuch like Controverſies: And as they, who oppoſed Her known Tradition, were accounted misbelievers; ſo thoſe who believed them, are declared by St. *Paul* to have had *the ſame Spirit of Faith*, that we 2 *Cor*: 4. 13. Shall not then *Chriſts* Church be as much enabled by God to paſs an infallible Deciſion, of

what is to be held now by us in point of Faith? The like Argument holds ſtrong in the Jewiſh Church, which from the time of *Moſes*, to the time of *Chriſt*, had ſome infallible means, beſides Scripture, to end all Controverſies, as appears by *Deutr.* 7 8. Where thoſe Words, *And they ſhall ſhew the Sentence of Judgment, and thou ſhalt do according to it? &c.* And thoſe other Words: *The Man that will do preſumptuouſly and will not hearken to the Prieſt, even that Man ſhall Die:* Clearly intimate the infallibility of this Judges Sentence. For God would never oblige all to follow an Erring Judgment, which defines often Lyes for Truth: And oblige all to imbrace thoſe Lyes, under pain of Death. *Secondly*, the Refuſers to embrace a Lie do not *do preſumptuouſly*, as God ſaies thoſe do who will not hearken to the Prieſts: He therefore ever ſaies the Truth. *Thirdly*, according to the true Tranſlated Bibles it is ſaid in the ninth verſe, of the Prieſt, *Who ſhall ſhew thee the Truth of the Judgment.* Which Words prove that God would aſſiſt in declaring always the Truth. *Fourthly*, it had been a moſt unjuſt Murther to put a Man to Death for not following that which might well be a Lie: God would never have enacted ſuch a Law. *Fiftly*, *Joſeph* the Jew *L. 2. contra Apion.* Teſtifies their *High Prieſts to have been their Judges of Controverſies.* And *Dr. Whitaker de Sacra Scrip: Pag:* 466. Acknowledging as much ſaies, *It was not Lawful to appeal, for otherwiſe there would have been no end of contention.* Shall *Chriſts* Church, which is the Miſtris and Lady, want that which the Jewiſh had, ſhe being but the Hand-maid?

2. Before I come to the Texts, which ſpeak particularly of Chriſts Church, I appeal to any ſober Judgement, who ſhall ponder them with due reflection, to Judge whether they be not to the very full, as clear to prove my intent, as any of thoſe, which any of our Adverſaries can bring, for any one of thoſe twenty four neceſſary points, which I have heretofore ſhewed to be clearly ſet down in no Scripture, tho' they affirm

affirm them all to have clear Texts of Scripture for them? Whence again I ask, how you can deny theſe my Texts to be clear, which are in any ſober Judgment as clear, as thoſe which you all hold (and muſt hold) to be clear? And particularly, I with the Texts I am now going to cite, were equally ballanced with thoſe Texts which Dr. *Ferne* and others cite, to prove that Scripture is our only Judge; for ſo my Reader (if he will but pleaſe to turn to thoſe Texts *Sect.* 10.) may ſoon ſee whether, even according to the Judgment of Scripture, (*their own only* Judge) the Church be not better proved to be our Judge, then the Scripture alone is proved to be ſo. And I deſire all to Note, how unjuſtly we are dealt withall, who being advantaged by the Peaceable Poſſeſſion of all publick Eccleſiaſtical Authority, which any Catholick Church had in the World, at that time in which you began your Reformation (all which Authority ſtood for the Churches being the Infallible Judge;) and yet no evidence of Scripture, half ſo good, being brought againſt this our Authority, as we can bring for it; we notwithſtanding were diſpoſſeſſed of it, and condemned of the moſt unjuſt Uſurpation that ever was, by thoſe who hold, that againſt publick Authority evident Demonſtration of Scripture muſt be brought. Examine the Texts I ſhall bring, and then examine your weak evidences brought in my tenth Section.

3. Again, before I cite theſe Texts, I muſt needs deſire my Reader to carry along with him in his mind one Note more, which is this; that all theſe Texts ſpeak of a Church, always teaching Truth in all points which She propoſes to be believed, and not in ſome certain points only. This I deſire much to be noted, becauſe our Adverſaries only acknowledge, that by theſe Texts the Church is ſecured from Erring Fundamentally, *To the ſubverſion of ſaving Faith;* as Dr. *Ferne* acknowledges, *Sect.* 20. This Confeſſion of theirs undoes all Religion; becauſe the Texts I am going to alledge ſpeak as Univerſally, and as far from all Limitation of the Churches

being by God ſecured from all kind of Error, Fundamental, or not Fundamental, as any Texts ſpeak of the Apoſtles or Prophets, being ſecured from all kind of Error, Fundamental, or not Fundamental: And you by Limitting theſe Texts to the only ſecuring of the Church, from only Fundamental Errors, do teach others in like manner, to Limit thoſe Texts by which the Prophets, or Apoſtles, are ſaid to be ſecured from Error, to only ſuch a ſecurity, as ſecures them from Fundamental Errors only; which would be a moſt Damnable Doctrine: For, thence would follow, that the Fundamental points being very few, *(as you ſay,)* all that is written or ſaid by the Apoſtles or Prophets, which concerns not thoſe few Fundamental points might be falſe, as being delivered by Men not ſecured from Error in any points not Fundamental. For my part, I take the moſt Fundamental point of Faith to be this; That there is a God ſpeaking Infallible Truth in all that he ſaies, by what Inſtrument ſoever any one of his ſayings, in any matter (whatſoever it be) is propoſed by him; whether this Inſtrument be the Church, as it was for the firſt two thouſand Years of the World, or the Prophets or Apoſtles raiſed up in his Church. And now let us proceed to our Texts.

4. *My firſt Text*, is out of the ſecond of *Iſa. v.* 2,3. *And it ſhall come to paſs in the laſt Daies* (ſo the Apoſtles called the time of the New Law) *that the Mountain of the Lords Houſe ſhall be eſtabliſhed in the top of Mountains*, (behold its great Viſibility, ſo that) *all Nations ſhall flow unto it*, (behold its vaſt extent,) *and ſay*, (with Joy,) *come yee and let us go up to the Mountain of the Lord, to the Houſe of the God of* Jacob: *And He* (note this Word *He*,) *will teach us his wayes*, (in this Houſe or Church;) *For out of* Sion *ſhall go forth the Law*, (as it did by the Apoſtles on *Whit-Sunday;*) *and the Word of God from* Jeruſalem, (from whence the Churches firſt Preachers began the divulging of their Doctrine:) *And he ſhall judge among the Nations*, (not in his Per-

Perſon, for *Chriſt* went not out of Jewry; but *he ſhall judge among the Nations,)* by his Churches Tribunal erected among all Nations, ſo conſpicuouſly, that they all may flow to it: Will any Man ſay, his Judgment is Fallible? In this Tribunal, it is *He who teaches us his Wayes:* Dare you ſay that *He teaches us Errors*? Is any Error, (tho' not Fundamental) *his Way? Chriſt* then, erecting a Church Viſible to the whole World, that the whole World might reſort with Joy unto it for neceſſary Inſtruction; and intending himſelf to inſtruct them by it, and by it to Judge among all Nations; had not complied with this Intention of his, if he had not ſecured that Church from all Error, by which *He himſelf teaches all the World his Wayes*, and not Superſtitious Errors. And had this his Church been lyable to paſs falſe Judgment, in deciding Controverſies about Faith; the Diſgrace had redounded to God, who Authorized that Tribunal, to be that very Court in which, to the Joy of all, *He judges among all Nations.*

5. *My ſecond Text*, is out of the ſame Prophet, C. 35. promiſing to us, at the coming of *Chriſt*, *a Way ſo direct*, (not only in it ſelf) but ſo direct *unto us that Fools cannot Err by it.* Is it not then Infallible? But of this Text I ſay no more here, becauſe I have pondered it already in the very *Preface*, *Num.* 3. I only note that this way, being ſo direct to us all, muſt needs be only in ſuch a Church, as is of a Vaſt Extent, and ſo Viſible every where in all Ages, that, all Men of all places might be in all Ages directed by it, and ſo directed as not to Err; *for Fools canno Err by it.* What more Infallible in order to us?

6. *My third Text* is out of the ſame Prophet, C. 54. where firſt mention is made moſt gloriouſly of the vaſt Extent of *Chriſts* Viſible Church; *Sing O barren, &c. Enlarge the place of thy Tent, and let them ſtretch forth the Curtains of thy Habitations. Spare not, lengthen thy Cords, and ſtrengthen*

then thy Stakes, for thou ſhalt break forth on the right hand and on the left, and thy Seed ſhall inherit the Gentiles. As I have ſworn that the Waters of Noah *ſhould no more go over the Earth, ſo I have ſworn that I would not be Wrath with thee,* (as I am with all who admit Superſtitions and foul Errors to Reign over them.) *Every Tongue that ſhall riſe againſt thee in Judgment thou ſhalt condemn.* The Tongues of all Heriticks be *Tongues that riſe againſt* the Church, in judging contrary to her definitions in matters of Faith: But fear not (O Church of God) *for every Tongue that ſhall riſe againſt thee in Judgment thou ſhall condemn:* Yea their very riſing in oppoſition of Judgement unto thee, is their condemnation; becauſe hence appears that the Church differs in Judgement from them, which is enough (in the Opinion of St. *Auſten*) to make us hold them Heriticks; For juſt in the end of his Catalogue or Book of Hereſies, he ſaies, *it is ſuperfluous to ſet down what the Church* (in particular) *has defined againſt them all:* But (ſaies he) *Scire ſufficiat eam contra iſta ſentire, Let it ſuffice* (for their condemnation of Hereſie) *that ſhe is contrary in her Judgment to them all.* And therefore it is not Lawful to hold any one of them. See *Sect.* 21. *n* 4.

7. *My fourth Text* is out of the ſame Prophet, *cap* 59. *v.* 20. *and* 21. which Text (*Rom.* 11. *v.* 26.) St. *Paul* Interprets to be ſpoken of the Church of *Chriſt*, to which, after his coming, many of the Jews were to unite themſelves being to be Baptized in it, Inſtructed in it, Governed by it, and conſequently the Text ſpeaks of ſuch a Viſible Church, as that muſt needs be, to whom the *Jews* Converted could Unite themſelves, to be by it Baptized, Inſtructed, Governed. To this Viſible Church thus ſaies our Lord; *As for me this is my Covenant with them, ſaies our Lord: My Spirit* (free from all Error) *that is upon thee and my Words* (free from Error great or little) *which I have put in thy Mouth,* (that Mouth, by which Viſibly ſhe does teach my wayes to all Nations that flow unto thee, that Mouth by which I Judge among

among all Nations, that Mouth which ſhall condemn every Tongue that ſhall riſe againſt it in Judgment) *My Words* (I ſay) *which I have put in* (this) *thy Mouth, ſhall not depart out of thy Mouth* (thus Viſibly Teaching, Judging, &c.) *nor out of the Mouth of thy Seed; nor out of the Mouth of thy Seeds Seed; ſaies the Lord from hence forth and for ever.* Behold here the Spirit of Truth intaled upon the Church Viſible, and Gods Words *put in her Mouth*, by which ſhe teaches all Nations in Her firſt Age; And *in the Mouth of her Seed*, by which ſhe teaches all Nations in the ſecond Age; *and in the Mouth of her Seeds Seed from thence forth and for ever*, by which ſhe teaches all Nations in the third Age, and in every other Age thence forth following to the end of the World. Find me then an Age, in which this Everlaſting Viſible Church ſhall teach any Error, tho' never ſo little? If you can do this, then in that Age his Covenant was made void.

8. *My fifth Text*, ſhall be out of the very next Chapter, (to wit, *Iſa.* 60. *v.* 10.) in which God by the Prophet Triumphed in the vaſt Extent and Glory of his Church Viſible, *The Sons of Strangers ſhall Build up thy Walls, and their Kings ſhall Miniſter unto thee, thy Gates ſhall be open continually*, (a Poor Glory if they admit in Idolatry, Superſtition, &c) *they ſhall not be ſhut Day nor Night, that Men may bring unto thee the Forces of the* Gentiles, *and that their Kings may be brought* (ſecurely from all Error to be inſtructed by thee:) *For the Nation and Kingdom which will not ſerve thee, ſhall periſh.* The ſenſe of which laſt Words is clearly this; What Nation ſo ever refuſes to ſerve the Church, by not ſubmitting to Her Doctrine, ſhall periſh, not temporally in this World, in which they often flouriſh; but Eternally in the next. It is therefore Damnable, not to ſubmit to the Doctrine of ſome Church which is Viſible at all times, and known to all Nations: For it could never be Damnable not to ſubmit to an Inviſible Church; There muſt then ever be ſome Viſible Church on Earth, which all Nations, under pain

pain of Damnation, are to ſerve; And to which, God may truly ſay, *The Nation and Kingdom that will not ſerve thee, ſhall periſh.* Now tell me, I pray, when this Engliſh Nation, by a National Synod *(as they call it)* acknowledged no Viſible Church which this Nation was bound to ſerve; but Decreed many things contrary to all the Viſible Churches: How eſcaped they this Sentence of Damnation? I confeſs Nations ſhould do well, and ſhould further their Salvation, in refuſing to ſerve all Churches then Viſible; if all thoſe Churches did both Err, and alſo Father their Lies upon God the Father of Truth; venting their own Errors for Divine Verities: But, I ſay, it is impoſſible that all the Viſible Churches in the whole World ſhould in any Age come to this paſs; for in every Age it muſt be true, that, *the Nation and Kingdom which will not ſerve thee, ſhall periſh.* But you will ſay perhaps, for theſe ten or twelve Ages her Errors have Eccliſped Her? Read then the following Verſes, *I will make thee an everlaſting Excellency*, (an excellent Church indeed which Fathers her Lies and Superſtition upon God himſelf. It follows, but ſhould not follow, if this were true; *and thou ſhalt ſuck the Breaſts of Kings, &c.* Yea, *thy Sun ſhall no more go down, neither ſhall thy Moon with-draw it ſelf: But the Lord ſhall be unto thee an everlaſting Light:* How an everlaſting Light? An everlaſting Excellency, which ended with an Eccliſpe of ſome thirteen Hundred Years; if ſhe failed with the third Age, as Dr. *Hammond* and others pleaſe to ſay? Which third Age was before *ſhe ſucked the Breaſt of Kings*, whence appears the falſity of their Aſſertion. Again, how does it follow; *the Daies of thy Mourning ſhall be ended*? when you make her to have had ſo ſad a time of Mourning as thirteen Hundred, or (at the leaſt) a Thouſand Years, under the Yoke of *Popery*? How truly then does God in the next Chapter, *v.* 7. promiſe her Sons, *that an everlaſting joy ſhall be unto them*: Whereas the Daies of *Popery* are acknowledged to have covered the Face of all Chriſtendom, four times as

long

long as the Day of Her true Joy? How then alſo it is ſaid to Her in the end of the next Chapter following, *thou ſhalt be called a City ſought for, and not forſaken*, if all this while ſhe were the Woman fled into the Deſert? Away, away, with theſe falſe Gloſſes; theſe Words of *Iſaiah*, muſt needs be underſtood of a Viſible Church, which was not only ſought for, but alſo Inhabited, *and not forſaken*, nor left forlorn, nor made abandoned by Idolatry, Superſtition, *&c.* And Errors intollerable, as Dr. *Ferne* calls thoſe of the Church, *Sect.* 19.

9. *My ſixth Text*, (for I will count all the many Texts, in the laſt number, but for one, which might be urged ſeverally, all having great force) ſhall be out of the Prophet *Daniel*, c. 2. v. 44. *In the Daies of thoſe Kingdoms, the God of Heaven ſhall raiſe up a Kingdom, which ſhall not be diſperſed, and his Kingdom ſhall not be delivered to another People.* And then to ſignifie the vaſt Extent, the manifeſt Viſibility, and Perpetuity of this Kingdom (which is his Church, founded by *Chriſt*,) it follows, *And it ſhall break in pieces, and conſume all theſe* (Idolatrous) *Kingdoms, and it ſhall ſtand for ever.* Behold here, God promiſing the Kingdom raiſed by him, that Kingdom of his only true Church, which Viſibly has by its Doctrine broke in pieces all Idolatrous Kingdoms of the known World, and is ſo well ſecured of Gods aſſiſtance, to preſerve it in quality of a Kingdom, that, even in this quality, it ſhall alwaies continue, *and ſtand for ever* a glorious Viſible Kingdom. And thus literally is fulfilled, that, *Luke* 1. 33. *And he ſhall Reign in the Houſe of* Jacob *for ever.* Whence I argue thus; No Church fallen into Hereſie, Schiſm, Idolatry, Superſtition; yea no Church fallen ſo deep towards Hell, as to Father groſs and intollerable Errors upon God, delivering them as Divine Verities, can be ſaid to be Gods Kingdom; or (being ſo foully fallen) to be his *ſtanding Kingdom;* or permitting groſs Errors to Reign in quality of Divine Verities, to be *the Houſe of* Jacob,

cob, in which he Reigns *for ever*. Therefore, to verify theſe Texts of Scripture, there muſt be found ſome ever Viſible Church upon Earth, a Church flouriſhing in quality of his ſtanding Kingdom, not fallen into ſuch Errors as you ſay did Raign; but a Church where *He*, and not any *Error may Reign*. This Kingdom, ſo ſecured from Error, is that which I call CHRISTS Viſible, Perpetual, and Infallible Church, *The Houſe of our Lord eſtabliſhed* (ſo as to ſtand Viſibly for ever,) *in the top of all Mountains, and all Nations ſhall flow unto it, and ſay come, and let us go up to the Mountain of our Lord, and to the Houſe of the God of* Jacob, in which, *He ſhall Reign for ever, and He will teach us his Wayes*, and not groſs Errors of Superſtition, Idolatry, and there *He ſhall Judge among the Nations;* Even *He* who cannot give a falſe Judgment, and conſequently infallible is his Tribunal erected here in his Church, to ſend forth his Decrees, by which he Governs, and Reigns. If Error be Preſident in this his Tribunal, Error ſhould Reign, and not *He:* I pray mark, how fitly all the above cited Texts agree with this Interpretation, and how Harmonically they explicate and confirm one another.

10. It is alſo a thing moſt remarkable, how, at the very firſt attentive Reading of theſe Texts, all theſe New upſtart Sects, (and *Socinianiſm* as well as the reſt, yea, and ſo much the ſooner, becauſe it never flouriſhed in one whole Pariſh;) how, I ſay, all theſe New upſtart Sects, preſently appear to be ſo exceedingly unlike to Gods only true Church, which is fore-told to be of ſo vaſt Extent, ſo Glorious for the Multitude, and magnificence of Her Profeſſors, *as King;* yea, *all Kings*, Princes, and chief Potentates of the Earth, ſo conſpicuouſly Viſible in all Ages, and Places; that there is no tollerable Interpretation to be thought of, by which theſe and ſuch like Texts can be applied to any one of theſe Congregations. Take *Proteſtaniſm*, and allow it to contain all theſe New fangled Sects; and yet all the Profeſſors of it, will not make the thir-

thirtieth part of Chriſtendom; altho' Chriſtendom be but the fifth part of the World. But take *Proteſtaniſm* as it was for ſome twelve hundred Years before *Luther*, and ſo down ward in every one of thoſe twelve Ages to *Luther;* and you will not find it to be the tenth thouſand part of the World, even by its own account: Yea, by true account it will be found not to have had one Pariſh any where. How then do ſuch kind of Religions agree to theſe Deſcriptions of the true Church in the Scripture? Eſpecially, if to the former places you add divers others of the ſame Nature, as that, *Iſa* 49. (which St *Paul Act.* 13. Interprets of the Church:) *It is a light thing that thou ſhould be my Servant to raiſe up* (only) *the Tribes of* Jacob; *I will alſo give thee, for a Light to the* Gentiles, *that thou mayeſt be my Salvation unto the end of the Earth. Kings ſhall ſee, and ariſe; Princes alſo ſhall Worſhip. Behold theſe ſhall come from far, and lo theſe from the North, and from the Weſt, and theſe from the Land* Sinam. *Sing O Heaven, and be joyful O Earth, the Children which thou ſhalt have ſhall ſay again, the place is to ſtrait for me: Give place to me that I may dwell; Kings ſhall be thy Nurſing Fathers, and Queens thy Nurſing-Mothers*, (they ſhall not be thy Heads, or Governours, but) *they ſhall bow down to thee with their Faces towards the Earth, and lick up the duſt of thy Feet*, (proſtrating themſelves to kiſs the Feet of thy Supream Paſtor.) Tell me now, of what Church ſpeaks this Prophet? Where was it Read alſo his next Chapter; *Kings ſhall walk in the brightneſs of thy riſing. Their Kings ſhall Miniſter unto thee*, and not Rule over thee, as thy chief Governours. And yet much more, *chap.* 62. particularly; *All Kings ſhall ſee thy noble one*, with that other eloquent expreſſion of the Churches Viſible Glorioufneſs, *Paſs ye, paſs ye through the Gates, and prepare a Way for the People, and make the Journey plain, and pick up the Stones, and lift up the Sign to the People: Behold, our Lord will make heard to the end of the Earth.* For, as David ſaid,

Pſal. 21. *v.* 28. *All the ends of the Earth ſhall remember, and be converted to our Lord, and all the* Families *of the* Gentiles *ſhall adore in his Sight.* And Malachy 1. 11. *from the riſing of the Sun even to the going down of the ſame, my Name ſhall be great among the* Gentiles, *and every where Incenſe ſhall be offered to my Name,* (as it is in the Roman Church,) *and a pure Offering* (of Chriſts pure Body.)

11. Theſe and divers ſuch like paſſages be ſo clear of the vaſt Extent, Majeſty, and Glory of the Church, with its Perpetuity in all Ages, that divers of our Adverſaries, not finding any Church upon Earth, but the *Roman*, to which they could be applyed, and perſwading themſelves that the *Roman* Church was falſe; became ſo wicked, as to deny all Chriſtian Religion, becauſe they could not ſee their own Scriptures verified in it, as it is moſt fully ſhewed in the *Proteſtants Apology Tract.* 2. *c.* 1. *S.* 5. There you ſhall ſee how this conſideration, made that Famous Proteſtant *David George* to preach againſt *Chriſt* and his Apoſtles. This made your chief Paſtor of *Heidelburg*, *Adam Nauſerus*, to turn *Turk.* This made your *Alemanus* to turn *Jew*, having been a great Diſciple of your great *Beza*, with a multitude of others here in *England*, cited by the above named Author. Now I conclude, that Chriſtianity cannot be maintained without ſuch a Church, as is here Deſcribed, to be found ſome where on Earth; which Church cannot be found if the *Roman* Church be ſuch a Church as you make her. But, whether She be *Chriſts* only true Church; and our Judge, we ſhall ſee hereafter. Now I go on.

SEC-

SECTION XV.

It is proved out of the New Teſtament, that the Church *is our Infallible Judge in all Controverſies of* Faith.

1. TO my ſix Texts out of the Old Scripture, I add ſix more out of the New. *My ſeventh Text*, then is *Matth.* 16. 19. *Upon this Rock I will Build my Church*, (that Church which *Chriſt* fore-told by the Prophets to be of ſo vaſt Extent, ſo Viſible in all Ages to the end of the World) *and the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it.* Of this Text Dr. *Ferne* treats in his whole twentieth Section. The ſubſtance is; that the *Roman* Church is but part of the Catholick Church, and ſo tho' the Gates of Hell had prevailed againſt Her; yet they had not prevailed againſt the Catholick Church. Yet ſaies he, *We acknowledge that Hell Gates did not prevail againſt the* Church of Rome *to a ſubverſion of the* Faith *in it, or a total infection of the Members of it, with all the Errors and Superſtitions that prevailed in it.*

2. Altho' it be not to my purpoſe (as long as I continue ſtill in a general ſearch, after ſome Infallible Church) to paſs to that particular inquiry, whether this Church be the *Roman* or no, (of which afterward:) Yet becauſe this prime Objection may be beſt ſolved in this place; I anſwer, that neither Dr. *Ferne*, nor any other Doctor, can find out upon Earth ſuch a Church, different from the *Roman*, as has been promiſed in the Texts of the former Chapter, to which all *Nations were to flow*, to which *Kings and Princes were to Miniſter*, *whoſe Gates ſhould be open Night and Day*, whoſe *Sun ſhould never ſet*, &c. For by the *Roman* Church, we do

do not underſtand the particular Dioceſs of *Rome;* but we underſtand all ſuch Churches, as are joyned in Communion to the *Roman*, as Members to their Head. Had Hell Gates prevailed againſt all ſuch Churches, where (I pray) had there upon Earth been found any one ſingle Church againſt which Church, Hell had not more prevailed, then againſt the *Roman*? Name but one, and I am ſatisfied. But that one muſt be ſhewed to have been perpetually conſpicuous, to which all Nations might flow, having Kings and Potentates of the Earth Miniſters unto Her; inſomuch that the Nations which would not ſerve Her (as the Nations joyned to the *Roman* Communion would not) ſhould periſh. That Church muſt have theſe and ſuch other Qualities, expreſſed by Scripture in my precedent Section. Knowing you could not find any Church upon Earth ſo qualified but the *Roman*, which taken (as we uſually take it) comprehends the Churches of all Nations joined in Communion unto Her, you are forced ſo to qualifie your cenſure of Her Errors prevailing in Her, that you ſay, *they prevailed not to a total infection of the Members of it, with all the Errors and Superſtitions that prevailed in it.* How come you to know this; if it be not upon Record, that ſome conſiderable quantity of Men in all Ages (ſufficient to conſtitute ſuch a Church, as we have ſeen *Chriſts* true Church muſt be) did not aſcent to all that was defined by the *Roman* Church, nor to other Errors as great as Hers, but kept themſelves to that which you call the pure Doctrine of *Chriſt:* If this be not upon Record, (as I was ſaying,) then you ſay you know not what: If it be upon Record, begin to tell me who theſe Men were in that ſecond, third, fourth, fifth, ſixth Age after *Popery*, againſt whom theſe Errors prevailed not; and I will trouble you with no further Examination of your Records. You can as well Eat a whole Mil-ſtone to Breakfaſt, as to prove any ſuch thing by any Records.

3. But you ſay the Fathers Interpreted this promiſe of the Gates of Hell not prevailing againſt the Church, of the not fail-

failing of the Church; and never of the not Erring of it. Thoſe who Object this, mark not that *the chief Way of* failing is to fail by Erring. How did the Church fail in the Dominions of the *Arians*, was it not by Erring? And ſo of all Dominions corrupted by Hereſie. So alſo the whole Viſible Church had failed, if the whole Viſible Church had propoſed any Error to be believed for a point of Faith; for to do this is to propoſe a Lie as upheld by Divine Authority; which is to fall no leſs foully then he ſhould fall who ſhould teach, God to be an affirmer and confirmer of Lies. For whatſoever point any Church held as a point of their Faith, they held it as a Divine Verity, affirmed and revealed by God: Therefore if in any Age the Viſible Church held any Error for a point of Faith, it did fail moſt miſerably; and yet your *Proteſtant* Doctors generally teach, that the only Viſible Church, did teach ſeveral Errors as points of Faith. So Dr. *Ferne* accuſes even the primitive Church, of teaching the Millenary Belief, and Infants Communion, though moſt falſely; as our Doctors often have ſhewed: Thus they throw dirt upon CHRISTS unſpoted Spouſe. And as the Black *Æthiopians* painted their Gods Black: So your foul Erroneous Church would have all Churches to have been foully Erroneous; as you would have even the pureſt Church to have been, had She propoſed theſe two groſs Errors for Divine Verities, as you ſay She did.

4. Yet to make a ſhew of ſomething like a Church, Dr. *Ferne* ſaies; *the Gates of Hell may prevail, not to the overthrowing of the Fundamental Saving Faith; but to Superſtruction of Hay, Stuble, and worſe, I mean Errors in Belief and practiſe; Yet ſuch as may ſtill be convinced by the Doctrine of Saving Faith, ſtill preſerved in the Church.* With theſe Superſtructions you charge the Roman Church, yet adding; *that ſhe has the Fundamental Faith in expreſs terms delivered down in her, and ſuch ſaving knowledge as was ſufficient to diſcern the Foundation from the Superſtructers.* All this is confident-

fidently ſaid by you; but ſtill (like your ſelf) you end the matter and offer no kind of Proof: Neither do you add any one Syllable to ſatisfy the great difficulties which occur in this confident Aſſertion, againſt which I have ſomething to ſay. Firſt, to aſſume ſuch Liberty to our private ſelves, of Limiting that which the Holy Ghoſt thought not fit to Limit; is to teach others to Limit ſuch Texts as promiſe Divine aſſiſtance to Scripture Writers, and to the Apoſtles, ſo, as to ſay in like manner, that they ſhall deliver nothing againſt the Fundamental Saving Faith, but yet that they may ſuperadd a vaſt multitude of their own private Fancies. *Secondly*, you cannot name a perpetual Viſible true Church, which *Chriſt* had upon Earth, againſt which this Error (for ſo you call it) did not prevail, of admitting for an Infallible Truth whatſoever was propoſed by the Church. Of this Error (if it be one) you can aſſign no begining in the *Roman* Church, (nor in any other Catholick Church:) But this Error, is a Fundamental Error, not only becauſe it layes the Foundation, upon which infinite Errors muſt be Built; but chiefly, becauſe it admits of no other ground upon which to found any Divine Faith; For it admits of Scripture it ſelf upon this only ground, See *Sect* : 20. *n.* 5. If this ground be an Error, the Foundation of all the Faith that is in the *Roman* Church is an Error, and an Error Fundamental, as properly as you can prove any Error to be Fundamental: For it makes the foundation of all our Faith to be an Error. Have you as good ground to ſay (as you do *Sect*: 6.) The *Arian* Hereſie is an Error directly Fundamental? Wherefore you muſt needs ſay that the Gates of Hell prevailed againſt the *Roman* Church to the Overthrow of Fundamental ſaving Faith. And then you will never be able to find *Chriſt* a true Viſible Church, by which you received your Doctrine, your Miſſion, your Ordination, your Succeſſion from the Apoſtles: For theſe you had not from the Greek Church. *Thirdly*, as I juſt now urged, every Church, to which you dare affirm the name of Catholick to have agreed, did teach all the Articles She propoſed

to

to be believed as Divine Verities revealed by God: Even the Greek Church did this. But now, as it is damnable, even in matters of ſmaleſt importance, to affirm with an Oath any Lie (becauſe we ſhould take God for a witneſs and aſſertor of our Lie;) ſo it is a moſt damnabe thing to all thoſe Churches, to propoſe Errors, even in matters of ſmaleſt importance for Articles of their Faith, to be believed as Divine Verities, revealed, and affirmed, and confirmed by God. If the *Roman* Church, as well as all the reſt, did this (as you muſt ſay ſhe did) ſhe was no Church, but a Synagogue of *Satan*, becauſe ſhe propoſed Lies to be believed equally to Divine Verieties, and thus did make the Spirit of Truth, to be the Father of her Lies: Wherefore, you muſt needs ſay the Gates of Hell prevailed againſt her ſufficiently, to bring her (and thoſe who followed her Doctrine) to Hell. But when, not only the *Roman*, but alſo all other Churches for the laſt thouſand Years did this, where will you find *Chriſt* ſuch a Church as Scriptures promiſe? From which Church you did receive your Doctrine, your Miſſion, your Ordination, your Succeſſion to the Apoſtles. *Fourthly*, neither you, nor any of yours, can tell (with any certainty) which be thoſe particular points by the belief of which the ſaving Faith is preſerved ſo, that, if all thoſe points be held, this Faith is held intirely; if they be not all held, ſhe is loſt. How blindly then do you proceed, when you affirm, *that the Gates of Hell prevailed not to the overthrow of Fundamental ſaving Faith*; which is more then you can know, unleſs you can tell in the belief of which particular points, this Fundamental Faith conſiſts. Do you think this was done *by preſerving ſtill in her ſuch knowledge as was ſufficient to diſcern the Foundation from the Superſtructer*? If this be enough, then *Arianiſm*, or any other Hereſie preſerving the Scriptures, and not having ſufficient force to aboliſh the knowledge of Principles, by which they may be reclaimed, may be ſaid not to have Erred in Fundamental ſaving Faith: For you ſay that in the Scripture all Fundamental points are clearly ſet down.

5. Now give me leave to urge the force of my Text God builds upon a Rock (a full expreſſion of greateſt ſecurity) not any Church, but that very Church deſcribed in my former Section out of the Prophets: And ſo all that hath been ſaid of that Church, muſt be verified of this; with a reiterated promiſe, *that the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it*: Without breach of which promiſe this Church could not have Erred ſo notoriouſly, as I have ſhewed; you affirm all Churches Viſible upon Earth, to have Erred; And particularly the *Roman* Church uſe to be ſtiled by yours, *Idolatrous*, *Superſtitious*, *the Seat of Antichriſt*, *the Synagogue of Satan*, *a neſt of Errors*, *covered with an univerſal Leproſie*, *overwhelmed with more then* Cymerian *darkneſs*, *averted by Apoſtacy from the whole Body Chriſt*. This is the Character you give of the *Roman* Church: And then, when we preſs you with this and other clear Texts; you, for your own ends, ſay, the *Roman* Church Erred not Fundamentally: Yet your Famous French Brother *Iohn Daille*, whoſe Book of Schiſm has been now twice or thrice publiſhed in *England*, in expreſs terms charges the *Roman* Church *With Fundamental Errors overthrowing the Foundations of Chriſtianity*, *c.* 7. And then in the next Chapter, he begins to ſhew how our Opinion of Adoring the Euchariſt is a Fundamental Error; in the proving whereof he labours even untill his nineteenth Chapter, the Title of which is, *That there be very many other Beliefs in the Church of* Rome *which overthrow the Foundation of our Faith*. And indeed he is the true Diſciple of *Calvin*, who *Inſtit*: 4. *c.* 18. ſaies of us; *They made all the Kings and the People of the Earth Drink from the firſt to the laſt*. Add now to this, that which *Dr. Whitaker Controv.* 4. *Q.* 5. *c.* 3. confeſſes in theſe Words; *In times paſt no Religion but the Papiſtical had place in the* Church, Therefore, (ſay I) if this Papiſtical Church was ſuch an one as yours deſcribe it; and if there were no other Church but this; the Gates of Hell prevailed againſt all Churches upon the

the Earth. And indeed the very claim which this Church makes to Infallibility, and Her conformably preſſing all the World to ſubmit to Her Definitions, and hold them for Divine Oracles, (if they be Errors,) *is the very bane of Chriſtendom*, as Dr. *Ferne* calls it, *Sect.* 27. For upon this Principle She may oblidge all to hold your Church (which you will ſay is *Chriſts* pureſt Church,) not to be any Church at all, but a damnable Congregation of Hereticks. How then have not the Gates of Hell prevailed againſt Her, who teaches the pureſt Church to teach moſt damnable Hereſie? And again, if Hell Gates have prevailed againſt Her; againſt what Church did they not, for a thouſand Years before *Luther*, prevail? So much of this Text.

6. My eight Text, to prove the Church to be our Infallible Judge, ſecured by God from leading us into an Error great or little, is, *Matth.* 18. 17. *He that will not hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a Publican or Heathen:* Therefore, meerly *for not hearing the Church*, a Man according to the true Judgment of God himſelf, is to be held (and conſequently does juſtly deſerve to be held) as a Publican or Heathen: But all Men are oblidged not to do that, by which ſo heavy a Judgment may deſervedly fall upon them: Therefore all Men are oblidged to hear the Church; the meerly not hearing of Her, deſerving ſo heavy a Judgment, even in the ſight of God; who ſaies in the next Verſe, that the Churches Judgment (condemning thoſe who refuſe to hear Her) ſhall be made good, and approved of in Heaven. No Man therefore is ſecure in Conſcience, or Innocent in the ſight of God, who refuſes to hear, or obey the Church. Hence follows, *Firſt*, that this Church cannot Err damnably, for ſo a Man in Conſcience might be bound to follow a damnable Error. *Secondly*, hence follows that She cannot Err in any ſmall matter belonging to Faith, for all Men being bound to hear Her, and follow what She teaches; and it being impoſſible any Man ſhould in Conſcience be bound to hold the leaſt falſity as an

Article of Faith revealed by God, (for that were to hold God a Revealer or Affirmer of a Lie,) it follows, that it is impoſſible the Church ſhould ever deliver any ſmall Error for an Article of Faith. In hearing and obeying the Church we follow Gods Command: But no kind of Error little or great, can be incurred by following Gods Command; therefore in hearing and obeying the Church we can be led into no kind of Error little or great.

7. Now if any one reply, that we are to hear the Church ſo long as She ſwarves not from Gods Word. My anſwer is; that to ſwarve from Gods Word, is to Err: But this Text proves She cannot Err: Therefore this Text proves She cannot ſwarve from Gods Word. And indeed, if She could Err, or ſwarve from Gods Word; the meerly not hearing, or not obeying Her, could not deſerve that a Man ſhould be juſtly accounted by God as a Publican or Heathen. See here, *N.* 16. Others reply that this Text is to be underſtood, not of hearing this Church in matters of Faith and Unbelief, but of matters of Treſpaſſes between Brother and Brother, which Treſpaſſes are alſo to be told to every particular Church and to ſeveral Prelates; and therefore this place makes nothing for the Authority of the Univerſal Church. I anſwer; particular Treſpaſſes are to be referred to particular *Prelates;* and that the Church is not to be Aſſembled in a general Council for every private Mans Treſpaſſes. Singular private Men are to be condemned by their particular Prelates of their particular Churches, proceeding according to the known Decrees and Orders of the Univerſal Church. If any Man, when they proceed thus, diſobeys them, he in them diſobeys the Univerſal Church; according to whoſe known Laws and Decrees, theſe Prelates clearly proceeded. And therefore, he meerly for this only Act of refractary diſobedience to the Church, deſerves, by Gods own Judgment, to be accounted as a Publican or Heathen. So we ſee, that every Man who diſobeys the particular

lar Judges, judging clearly according to the known Laws of the Common-Wealth, diſobeys the Common-Wealth. And it is this refractary diſobeying, and not hearing the Church, which makes the Crime ſo enormous: For this teaches others to do the like; and ſo all Government falls to confuſion, all Order to Diſorder. Whence you may eaſily ſee, that the not obeying and following particular Prelates, in ſo well Ordered a Common-Wealth as the Church is, does commonly come to be the very ſelf ſame enormous Crime of not hearing the Church. And, becauſe all particular Prelates of the Church, are ſuppoſed (if the contrary be not notorious,) to do their Duty in giving Sentence according to the known Decrees, Orders, and Canons of the Univerſal Church, thoſe who diſobey the Prelates of particular Churches, muſt (by no leſs general a manner of ſpeaking) be ſaid to diſobey the Univerſal Church; as thoſe, who diſobey the Judge, are ſaid to diſobey the Common-Wealth. So that at laſt, this diſobedience againſt the Church, is againſt *Chriſt* and *God* himſelf, according to that which God ſaid to *Samuel*, *Lib* 1. *c.* 8. *They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me:* And *Chriſt* to his Diſciples, the firſt Prelates of the Church; *He that deſpiſes you, deſpiſes me. Luke* 10. Whence you did ſee *Sect.* 8. *n.* 6. how St. *Auſten* taught us, that if there were a Man appointed by God to be heard by us, (and known to be ſo commiſſioned,) no Body would dare to refuſe Obedience unto him in what he taught; leaſt ſo doing, he ſhould be truly Judged, not ſo much to have refuſed Obedience to this Man, as to have refuſed it to God, who gave Commiſſion to this Man. Juſt ſo (as St. *Auſten* alſo diſcourſes) being it is God who gave this Commiſſion to the Church, obligding all to hear Her, with ſo ſtrict a Command, that the Refuſers are to be Judged, by his expreſs Order, as Publicans and Heathens; he who refuſes to ſubmit to this Church, for doing ſo, is truly Judged not ſo much to diſobey the Church, as to diſobey God who gave the Commiſſion to the Church: See *Sect.* 22.

22. *n.* 5. And therefore *Christ* Commanded the Lawful Succeſſors of *Moſes* to be Obeyed, in what they Commanded (to wit, either by publick Authority, or by known the Doctrine or practiſe formerly ordered by publick Authority;) altho' theſe Succeſſors of *Moſes* were Men, not only wicked in their Lives, but alſo did (on their private Authority) teach Errors, and that publickly; Yet never Authorized by any one publick Definition of the Seat of *Moſes*. And they were theſe never Authorized Errors of theirs, which *Chriſt* called *the Leaven of the Phariſees*; bidding his Apoſtles take heed of it. But now, foraſmuch as concerns the Doctrine, which was Authorized by the publick Definition of that Seat, *Chriſt* was ſo far from bidding, even the common People, to take heed of it, that he ſaid publickly, *to the* whole promiſcuous *Multitude, and alſo to his Diſciples; Upon the Chayr of* Moſes *have ſitten the Scribes and Phariſees, all therefor whatſoever they bid you, obſerve and do.* (*Matth.* 23. *v.* 1. Note thoſe moſt ample Words (*All therefore whatſoever.*) Or will you ſay, what if they bid us do againſt the Scripture; what muſt you do? I anſwer that, juſt as you muſt ſay concerning that Voice which came from Heaven, commanding (Matth 17.) *to hear our Saviour, Ipſum audite*, was not to be eluded by the Phariſees, ſaying, *hear him if he teach no falſity*; but was a Declaration from Heaven, *that he, who was ſo Univerſally to be heard, ſhould be ſecured from teaching any falſity*: See *Sect.* 22. *n.* 5. So alſo theſe Words, *all therefore whatſoever*, And theſe Words of the Text I am now urging, *if any Man will not hear the Church*, &c. be Words containing a Declaration made by our Saviours own Mouth, that the Old and New Church ſo Univerſally commanded to be heard, were ſecured from teaching any falſity. And I ſhall anſwer, before I end all your chief Objections to the contrary, *Sect.* 23.

8. Now as the Synagogues Authority was to be heard, *in all whatſoever they did bid* in matter of Doctrine, and not

only in point of Treſpaſſes between Brother and Brother; we cannot (without notably depreſſing the Authority of *Chriſts* Church, and caſting of it under the Synagogue) allow to the Synagogue a Power to be Univerſally heard *in all what ſoever*, and yet confine the Authority of *Chriſts* Church to thoſe narrow limits of being heard only in point of Treſpaſs between Brother and Brother; whereas the Synagogue is but the Handmaid, the Church the Soveraign Lady, and *has a better Covenant eſtabliſhed upon better promiſes. Hebr:* 8. 6. The force then of my Text is this, *If any one will not hear the Church*, even in Treſpaſs between Brother and Brother belonging to Her Court, *let him be accounted as a Publican or Heathen*; and much more, let him be ſo accounted if he will not hear the Church in ſuch Treſpaſſes which one Brother commits againſt all his Brothers, and againſt Deareſt his Mother the Church; this being incomparably a crime more hainous, and more particularly belonging to the Court of the Church; over which crime if God had not given Her Power, he had not given Her ſufficient Power for Her own preſervation, as every Common-wealth has, and of neceſſity muſt have; eſpecially ſo ample a Common-wealth, as was intended to be dilated over the whole Face of the Earth, and to be eſtabliſhed in a vaſt Extent for ever. Wherefore as our Adverſaries uſe to ſay, that every Kingdom or Common-wealth muſt needs have Power to make Laws and Statutes of ſufficient Efficacy, to keep off all forraign Juriſdiction, by which it may be ruined, becauſe as *Suarez* ſaies (*lib.* 3. de Primat. Pont. *c.* 1 *n* 4.) *Humane Nature cannot be deſtitute of neceſſary Remedies to its own Preſervation*; ſo we ſay God having erected a Kingdom to ſtand for ever, as *Daniel* called his Church, (of which I ſpoke the laſt *Sect. n.* 9.) he cannot but be ſuppoſed to have given this his Kingdom, or Church, that Eccleſiaſtical Power which was requiſite to preſerve it from all ſecular inſurrections, againſt the Eccleſiaſtical or Spiritual Power thereof; or elſe it might eaſily be quitted and caſt off by them all. This Kingdom then, being to Reign

in

in the middle of all Nations, he gave it a Spiritual Juriſdiction over all Nations, inſomuch, as he ſaid to his Church; *The Nation and Kingdom which will not ſerve thee, ſhall periſh: Of which I ſpoke* more the laſt *Sect. n* 8. Whoſoever then broached any Hereſie as a Poiſoned Cup prepared to the ruin, not of our Brothers Body; but of as many Brothers Souls as he can any way intice to drink thereof: If he ſtill perſiſts in this malitious practice, and ſo, to the notorious Treſpaſſing of all his Brethren and Deareſt Mother, continues committing this Soul-Murthering Crime of Hereſie, (a Crime the moſt deſtructive of the Common good that can be thought of) he is queſtionleſs to be proceeded againſt by the Church: To which if he ſubmit not, he, moſt deſervedly, in the higheſt Degree, is to be accounted as a Publican or Heathen. And Note, that all Hereticks are not only guilty of this Soul-Murthering Crime of Hereſie: But by ſtanding out againſt the Prelates of the Church, in the maintaining of their Hereſie, they fall into Schiſm; which Crime of its own Nature (as St. *Thomas* affirms) is the moſt hainous Treſpaſs againſt our Brothers, and againſt the moſt ſolemn Band of Fraternal Charity that can be committed. If therefore Treſpaſſes againſt our Brethren belong to the Court of the Church, and ſhe is here by God made the Judge thereof, with what high prerogative of having Her Sentence ratifyed in Heaven! Then doubtleſs thoſe whom ſhe condemns are condemned Perſons, both in the ſight of God and Men. She therefore under ſo great a Penalty, being to be heard, is ſecured from all kind of Error in Her Sentence, or Decree. And as the broaching of Hereſie and the ſtanding out in defence of it by Schiſm, is incomparably more deſtructive to our Brethren, and offenſive to our Mother the Church, when this is done by a great Multitude or a whole Nation; ſo, in this Caſe, the Crime more nearly concerns the Court of the Church, and ſhe is impowered to paſs Sentence againſt it, which being no leſs, but rather more juſt, then in the former Caſe, will no leſs, but rather more aſſuredly, be ratified

fied in Heaven. I note this for *Dr. Ferns* ſake, who, under pretence of Reformation, licences a whole Nation to ſtand out againſt all other Churches. *S.* 4.

9. Here fitly comes in the diſcuſſing of that (which ſome inconſiderately uſe, to elude the force of this Text;) that this Sentence of the Church conſiſts onely in an Exterior Excummunication, in which ſhe may Err, and the party (erroneouſly Excommunicated) may be a juſt Man in the ſight of God. I anſwer; if we deceive not our ſelves by putting a Cauſe different from that which concerns the true underſtanding of this Text; the matter will ſoon be cleared. This Text ſpeaks of one who will not hear, nor ſubmit to the Church after ſhe has given Sentence againſt him: Give me a man, who, in this caſe, does not ſubmit to the Church, and this very not ſubmiſſion of his, cannot but be that very crime, for which *Chriſt* himſelf holds him accountable as a Publican or Heathen; and affirms that this Sentence ſhall be ratified in Heaven: Wherefore it is impoſſible this Cenſure ſhould be unjuſt, if he be truely guilty of not hearing the Church. It is true that by falſe Information, or ſome ſuch way, a Man may be Judged to be guilty of not hearing the Church, when really in the ſight of God he is not guilty; and ſo there may ſometimes be an Error in the miſtake of the Fact: And thus *Clave errante*, by an Error only in matter of Fact (in which the Church is not infallible,) the Sentence will not be ratified in Heaven. But this is nothing to the purpoſe of our Adverſaries, who would have a Man be Innocent in the ſight of God, who profeſſes in many particulars not to conform to what the Sentence of the Church commands all to conform; for example, to Adore the Sacred *Euchariſt*, &c. Every Man who profeſſes this, profeſſes not to hear the Sentence of the Church, which is ſtill by ſevere Cenſures preſſing this upon him. Wherefore in pronouncing Sentence here, (where the Fact of not hearing the Church is maintained as good and laudable,) there can be no Error in the Fact: For

they confeſs and profeſs that here they neither do, nor will hear the Church; againſt which they (with Dr. *Ferne*, Sect. 10.) ſay, they have *Evidence of Scripture, Demonſtration of Reaſon, and a conformable conſent of Primitive times, the pure Ages of the Church.* Wherefore when the Church pronounces theſe Perſons, ſo notoriouſly refractary, to be accounted as Publicans or Heathens; Her Sentence ſhall be ratified in Heaven; and either Scripture muſt be falſe, or thoſe Men guilty.

10. That all may clearly ſee what an empty boaſt this is, which Dr. *Ferne* and others make of their having *Evidence of Scripture againſt what our Church teaches;* I challenge him, or any other, to ſhew, if he can, by Scripture only, (for that you all make your Judge) that the Texts which here I alledge for the Church Her being our Infallible Judge, cannot be Interpreted truely, as our Church ſaies they are to be Interpreted. For to ſhew this, it is not enough for you to deviſe ſome different Interpretation, in which it is impoſſible for theſe Texts to be taken: For it is no Proof to ſay, *This may be the true Interpretation, therefore it is ſo: Or, it ſeems probably to be ſo, therefore evidently this, and no other but this Interpretation is true:* But you muſt, (and that by evidence of Scripture only) ſhew that theſe Texts cannot be truely Interpreted, as our Church Interprets them; and you muſt prove by Scripture only, that the Tradition, by which She has received theſe Interpretations, is not a true Tradition deſcended from the Apoſtles. For if it be a true Tradition, (the contrary to which can never be evidently Demonſtrated out of Scripture alone) She is grounded as well as thoſe who received their Doctrine from Scripture only. For the Tongues of the Apoſtles were as Infallible as their Pens, and what they ſaid, and cauſed to be reduced to practiſe all the World over, is far leſs ſubject to be either counterfeited, or miſtaken, then their Writings. You alſo will never anſwer what I ſaid, that theſe Texts, which now I am bringing for this point, be as

clear

clear evidences out of Scripture for the Churches being our Infallible Judge, as thoſe other Texts brought by you, and examined here by me, *Sect.* 10. be clear evidences to Demonſtrate that Scripture only is to be our Judge; which point, if you cannot make more evident out of Scripture, then I can make this point; it is manifeſt, that you ſtand out againſt all the Prelates of all the Churches under which you lived before your diviſion, without convincing them by evidence of Scripture, that you might and ought refuſe ſubmiſſion to them. The Church then being in Poſſeſſion of Her Authority over you, and not manifeſtly convinced by you with any evidence of Scripture, (of the evidence of which there is far more Reaſon She ſhould be Judge, then you:) you, for not hearing Her, are by Her juſt Sentence denounced to be held as Publicans or Heathens; and this Sentence is ratified in Heaven.

11. *My Ninth* Text, to prove the Church Infallible in Her Definitions and Judgments, is out of St. *Paul*, 1 *Tim.* 3. calling Her, *The Church of the Living* GOD, *the Pillar and Ground of the Truth.* May not all ſecurely rely in their Faith upon the very Pillar of Truth? May they not, moſt groundedly ground their Faith upon the very Ground of Truth it ſelf? What do we ſay more? Now I pray, what poſſibility can there be for you to ſhew by evident Scripture, that this Text is not capable of this Interpretation, which our Church gives unto it? In place of ſhewing this, (which only makes to the purpoſe;) you go about to ſhew that Text *may have* other Interpretations, therefore (you infer) this is not the true one: Which is a pittiful Argument. For what Text was ever cited by St. *Paul*, or other Apoſtles, which might not have had ſome other Interpretation put upon it? Thus in place of bringing evident Scripture againſt us, you ſtill bring your own Interpretations of it; as if Scripture (fallibly Interpreted by you) were to be our Judge. What Text have you for that? If you ſay, Scripture Interpreted truely, muſt be our Judge; but you do Interpret it truly; therefore Scripture,

as you Interpret it, muſt be our Judge. What Heretick will not ſay thus much for his Damnable Interpretations? Tell me then, what Interpretation can be Demonſtrated to be the only true one, which is different from our Interpretation? Which ſaies thus; the Church being the Pillar it ſelf of Truth, we may, without fear of ever Erring, rely upon Her? She being the very Ground of Truth it ſelf; we are ſecurely grounded, as long as we are grounded on Her Authority. What have you in Scripture only, to prove this Interpretation to be manifeſtly falſe; as you muſt prove it againſt ſo publick Authority? What (I ſay) have you out of Scripture only to Demonſtrate this? Nothing: But, in place of bringing us evidence of Scripture, ſo vainly boaſted of; you bring us, for your beſt anſwer, an Interpretation of your own, which you ſay muſt be true, becauſe, perhaps it may be true; As if I ſhould ſufficiently prove that *A. B.* muſt be a Thief, becauſe perhaps he may be ſo. To anſwer in the like Form, I may as well ſay, this Interpretation of yours muſt be falſe: Becauſe perhaps it may be falſe. But let us hear what your beſt Interpretation is. You commonly ſay, there is a double Pillar, and a double Ground: One Pillar, or Ground which is Principal, and that is the Scripture; another Pillar or Ground ſubordinate to the former, and that is the Church. But this double dealing in diſtinguiſhing helps you not. The Church muſt ſtill be a true Pillar and a Ground of the Truth. *The People believed God and Moſes*, ſaies the Scripture, *Exod.* 14. *v.* 31. *Moſes* was infinitely under God, and ſubordinate to him, as the Church is under Scripture and ſubordinate to it: And yet this did not hinder but that all the People did moſt truly believe *Moſes*, and ground their Faith on what he ſaid; becauſe, they knew he had received what he Taught, from God. So all the ſubordination the Church has to Scripture, does not hinder, but that we may truely rely in our belief upon the Church, as the People relied upon *Moſes*; becauſe we alſo know that what the Church teaches, She has re-

received from God by *Christ*, and his Apoſtles. Again, the Tradition or Doctrine of our Church, is as ſecure as the Tradition or Doctrine of the Church in the Law of Nature was, for all thoſe two thouſand Years, which were before all Scripture: But then Men might (and all did,) ſecurely rely on that Church as the Pillar and Ground of Truth, on which all their Faith relied: *Ergo*, they may now thus rely on *Chriſts* Church. Again, what clear Text have you to prove, that *Chriſts* Church is leſs ſecured from falſity, then that Church? Had not this ground been ſure enough, (as it had not if that Church had been Fallible,) the Faith of all the World could not have been grounded ſufficiently upon it: And that, which is moſt to our purpoſe, at that very time in which St. *Paul* did call *the Church the Pillar and Ground of Truth*; he did call Her ſo before the Canon of the Scripture was finiſhed, before which time, you your ſelves confeſs the Church might be, and was ſecurely relied upon in all points of Faith; and no one Chriſtian can, by any Text, be proved to have then underſtood St. *Paul* to ſpeak theſe Words of the Church, as of a Pillar and Ground of Truth, ſubordinate to the Canon of Scripture when it ſhould be finiſhed. How then comes this now to be the only true ſenſe of Scripture? What Text have you to prove (and that Demonſtratively) that the Church of CHRIST, which before any Word of the New Teſtament was Written, was the Pillar and Ground of Truth; and that ſo Univerſally, that She was ſecured from propoſing any Error to be believed, were it great or little: But yet She, immediatly upon the Writing of the Scripture (confirming this Title unto Her,) became leſs Univerſally a Pillar and Ground of Truth, and more ſubject to Error then before? You, who will have nothing of moment held without clear Scripture: Shew but one ſingle clear Text of Scripture for this. More again of this, *Sect.* 16. in the begining, *N.* 1, 2, 3.

12. Another ſhift to elude the force of my Text, is, to ſay; that by theſe Words St. *Paul* intended only to ſet forth the

the Office of the Church, and not Her Authority. For Gods ſake mark how you handle Scripture againſt us. You ſay you will bring *evident demonſtration of Scripture*, and now you bring your meer conjectures of St. *Pauls* inward and ſecret Intention, known to God only. Let me then ask you. What Text tells you clearly that St. *Paul* had only an intention to ſet forth the Churches Office, and not Her Authority? Whereas, in fewer Words, I think it ſcarce poſſible more fully, and more emphatically, to ſet forth Her Infallible Authority, then by tetming Her *the Pillar and Ground of the Truth*; which Words ſtrike ſo ſtrong upon our underſtandings, even at the firſt hearing of them, that the firſt conſequence we can make from hence, is; *therefore upon this Pillar of Truth we may ſecurely rely in our Belief of Truth; therefore upon this Ground of Truth we may ſafely ground our Belief.* Concerning the Office of this Church, no Man thinks, untill he be put in mind, or has turned a while his underſtanding to the ſearch of ſeveral Interpretations. St. *Paul* then uſing Words as ſufficient to declare the Infallible Authority of the Church, as Men in ordinary ſpeach uſe to do, yea, uſing a moſt Expreſſive Metaphore, which comes fully home to this intent; what do you but tell us your bare conjectures (and thoſe moſt weakly grounded) when you tell us, you know his Intention was not to declare the Authority of the Church. Some prove this weak conjecture by another weaker. For they ſay, to what purpoſe was it for St. *Paul* inſtructing *Timothy*, how to behave himſelf in the Church of God, to ſet forth unto him Her Infallible Authority? I anſwer, that it was not only much to the purpoſe to inſtruct all poſterity in one of the moſt neceſſary points; but alſo it was moſt pertinent to that particular end of moving *Timothy* to behave himſelf irreprehenſibly in the Church, becauſe ſhe was conſtituted the Publick Oracle for all the World, that all in all Ages might come to Her for ſecure Direction in their Faith, and for aſſured Deciſion of all their Controverſies (ſhe being the Pillar and Ground of Truth) St. *Paul* thought fit

to

to admoniſh *Timothy*, and all other Prelates in his Perſon, ſo to behave themſelves, as not, by their misdemeanor, to make Men think it improbable that God ſhould give a perpetual Infallible aſſiſtance to ſuch a Church, whoſe prime and firſt Governours (who ſhould be the Patern of the reſt), lived ſcandalouſly or leſs Godly. How much do (not your Multitude only) but even your greateſt Doctors, think themſelves to ſay againſt the Church of *Rome*, claiming this Infallibility, (yet improbably ſay you;) becauſe Her Prelates have been Avaricious, Cruel, Laſcivious, or otherwaies Scandalous? This indeed is a pittiful Argument, for ſo it ſhould be proved improbable that God aſſiſted Infallibly wicked Men to Write (without the leaſt Error) ſome parts of the Holy Scripture. And yet we know *David* was both an Adulterer and Murtherer; *Salomon* was an Idolater, *who went after* Aſtoroth *the Goddeſs of the* Sidonians, *and after* Michom *the abomination of the* Amonites, 1 *Kings* 11. *v.* 5. 7. Of diverſe Books we know not the Authors, and ſo we cannot tell whether they were good or bad. Yet as pittiful an Argument as this is, we know it troubles weak Souls; and therefore you uſe it againſt us. Wherefore, to take away all ſcandal from theſe little ones, it was very convenient that Biſhops, eſpecially thoſe who firſt held that place in the Church, (as *Timothy* did) ſhould be *blameleſs*, *continent*, *vigilant*, *ſober*, *of good behaviour*, &c. For ſuch good Precepts as theſe were here given by St. *Paul*, as much making to his purpoſe, to maintain the credit of ſuch a Church as might ſeem to all, fit to be that which indeed was conſtituted the Publick Oracle of the World, the Pillar and Ground of Truth.

13. *My tenth Text* is out of the laſt Words of St. *Matthew*. *Go you therefore, and teach all Nations, Baptizing them*, &c. *And lo I am with you always, even to the end of the World.* The Apoſtles in their own Perſons, were not to be here Teaching and Baptizing untill the end of the World: Therefore, not only according to St. *Auſtin* and St. *Hierom*

upon

upon this place, but also according to manifest Reason, these Words were spoken as a promise, both to them and to their Successors for ever, by whom they were for ever to be teaching all Nations, and Baptizing: And consequently this promise was made to the Assembly of Teachers, Doctors, and Bishops of that Visible Church, in which they were Visibly to perform all that belonged to the Instruction of all Nations unto the Worlds end. That Church which had no such Visible being in all Ages, has no share in this promise; for who is not the party to which the promise is made, has no part in the promise. You then, having no share in it, enviously labour to lessen it, by saying; that it is not to be understood, that there should be equallity of assistance in all Ages, securing the Church at all times from all Error in every Age, as She was secured in the first Age, when She was Governed by the Apostles; And after they had Written the Scriptures, there was no further need of any other Infallible Rule; a lesser assistance therefore might serve after Ages. I answer, that this is only to tell me what you think might be said: But where is your *Evidence of Scripture*, to Demonstrate that the assistance God promised was indeed extended to Infallibility in the first Age; but was not so in any other Age? I ask for Infallible Texts, and not for Fallible Reasons: Tho' I must tell you, that according to Reason, after the first Age (when the Church was now grown from a grain of Mustard-seed to be a vast Tree, extending Her Branches from Sea to Sea, and still growing to a greater Extent,) in process of following Ages, there must needs, in so hudge a compass of the World, imbracing Men of different understandings, Dictamens, Principles, Educations, Instructions, Humors, and Wills; there must (I say) needs happen in the Progress of many Ages, (still removed further, and further from *Christs* time, and the dayes of his Apostles,) a World of Doubts, Debates, and Controversies, some affirming such and such Books to belong to the true Canon of Scripture, others rejecting them as

po-

pocripha. Some affirming ſuch and ſuch Copies to be the only true uncorrupted Copies of thoſe Books, others affirming thoſe Copies to be corrupted, and others different from them to be the only true ones. And again, after they had agreed upon the true Books, and the true Copies, (tho' perhaps they might in that agree in a Fundamental Error,) yet they would be ſure mainly to diſagree about the true ſence of thoſe Copies. Why then might not *Chriſt*, to ſecure his Church from Erring in ſo important Controverſies, (undecidable by Scripture,) promiſe alſo an aſſiſtance extended to Infallibility in latter Ages, as well as in the firſt Age? For Infallibility was given to the Apoſtles, not for their own ſakes, but for the good of thoſe whom they were to teach, and to ſecure them from Error. Now the Chriſtian People of after Ages were incomparably more in number, and their very number made them incomparably more ſubject (in Proceſs of many Ages ſtill remoter from *Chriſt*,) to be led into inextricable Errors; wherefore ſurely they did exceedingly need this Infallible aſſiſtance, given as I ſaid, for the Peoples ſake. Thoſe who had been inſtructed by the Apoſtles, before Scripture was Written, converted and Inſtructed thouſands, who never had heard any Apoſtle Preach: All theſe Believed upon the Authority of the then preſent Church, and their Faith was Infallible; therefore that Church, which was then before Scripture, had an Infallible aſſiſtance to ſecure Her from propoſing any Error. What Scripture tells you She loſt this aſſiſtance when Scripture was Written? And that Men could not rely upon Her Authority, when now, beſides the help of Tradition, She had alſo the help of Scripture to Rule Her ſelf by? See this more fully, *Sect.* 16. *n.* 2. You ſay, this Infallible aſſiſtance was leſs neceſſary for Her after She had received the Scripture. I might ſay, it was more neceſſary; becauſe in Proceſs of time Hereticks would ariſe, who would affirm the Scriptures to have been purpoſly Written to be our ſole and only Rule of Faith; and this they would ſay of Scripture as Interpreted by them,

and not as Interpreted by any Infallible Visible Interpreter. This Heresie, into which all Hereticks have ever fallen, makes the necessity of an Infallible assistance greater after the Writing of Scripture, then it was before. Again, what Scripture tells you that God is so sparing in his providing means for the Direction of his Church, that, giving them Scripture, he will substract his assistance formerly extended to Infallibility, and not leave them with their Bibles in their Hands, to go which Way every one in his private Judgment shall think fittest, without the former Direction of a Publick, Visible, and Infallible Guide? Had we not better have kept such a Guide still? Dr. *Ferne* could not but acknowledge, *that such a Visible Infallible Judge, or Umpire of all Christendom, would (if to be had) be a ready means to compose all differences, and restore Truth and Peace. Sect.* 27. The Church was this Infallible Visible Judge before Scripture was Written; and it is also confessed, that such a Judge would now, after we have the Scripture be an exceeding benefit: Why then do you say, God took away this inestimable Guift from his Church with one Hand, when he gave the Scripture with the other; there not being the least Text in Scripture for so important an Assertion? I think any one would hold it most rash to say, that St. *John the Evangelist*, after he had Written the last Words of the whole Canon or Scripture, presently lost his Infallibility in Teaching, Instructing, Guiding, Interpreting, *&c.* Why then should the whole Church of *Christ* loose that Infallibility which confessedly She had before the Canon was quite finished? Again, you cannot say the Scripture was superfluously Written, tho' the Church, before the Writing thereof, was an Infallible Guide: How then can you say the Infallible Guidance of the Church is superfluous, after the Writing of the Scripture? Especially, being such an Infallible Guidance is even now confessed to be so ready a means to end all Controversies; which among those who admit no such Guides, are endless. See also my next *Sect. n.* 1, 2, 3. *Christ* therefore,

not

not only in the firſt Age, but even to the Conſummation of the World, is with his Church; But he is not with thoſe who introduce and Father upon him, as the firſt Revealer thereof, many groſs and intollerable Errors, and Superſtitions, as you call thoſe which you found in all Churches upon the Face of the Earth, this laſt thouſand Years: Therefore theſe laſt thouſand Years he was not with his Church, or elſe Her Errors were not ſuch as needed ſo ſad a Reformation as yours was, to the diſturbance of all Chriſtendom. If Her Errors were tolerable, they ſhould (to avoid ſo great miſchiefs) have been tolerated: If they were intolerable, how was *Chriſt* with Her? Or what other Church can you name, whoſe Errors were not as intolerable? Now that all may clearly ſee, that this promiſe of *Chriſt* aſſured the Church of an aſſiſtance extended to an Infallible ſecurity from all Error Fundamental, or not Fundamental; This will appear by that farther, and fuller Explication made of this promiſe in St. *John*, who writ on purpoſe to explicate more fully ſome points, leſs fully ſet down by the former Evangeliſts.

14. *My eleventh Text* then is out of St. *John*, where *c.* 14. *v.* 15, Our Saviour ſaies; *I will pray the Father and he will give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of Truth whom the World cannot receive.* And *v.* 27. *The Comforter which is the Holy Ghoſt, whom the Father will ſend in my Name, he ſhall teach you all things, and ſuggeſt unto you all things whatſoever I ſhall ſay unto you.* (Fundamental or not Fundamental.) And *c.* 16. *v.* 12. *I have yet many things to ſay unto you*, (the Fundamentals be not many things, as you all confeſs;) *How be it, when the Spirit of Truth is come, he will Guide you into all Truth*, not only Fundamental, but alſo not Fundamental, which belong to thoſe many things which I (who have told you things Fundamental,) have not yet told you. In theſe things *this Spirit will Guide you into all Truth.* But all Truth excludes all Errors, not only in Fundamental, but alſo in not

Fundamental points. You know not which points be Fundamental, which not; which deſtructive of Salvation, which not; which cureable, which incureable; Yet fear not: Believe the Church in Teaching theſe or any other points; for She, Guided by this Spirit of Truth, will Guide you into all Truth. But you will ſay, how long ſhall Her chief Paſtors have this great Priviledge? *For ever*, ſaies the firſt part of my Text; by which Words it is made evident that the promiſe was made, not only to them for themſelves, (they not being to live *for ever* Teaching us theſe Truths;) but alſo for their Succeſſors in the prime Government of the Church, who were to Guide the People into all Truth *for ever*; as I ſhall preſently ſhew further out of St. *Paul*. I argue hence (juſt as I did before;) This aſſiſtance which was promiſed *for ever*, was *ever*, and in all Ages, performed; therefore in thoſe ten Ages (which made the thouſand Years before your Reformation,) this promiſe was performed; therefore what All the prime Prelates of the Church did teach all that while for Truth, was not Erroneous, or Superſtitious: But in all theſe Ages they all confeſſedly did teach for Truth thoſe very points, which you hold to be our groſſeſt Errors; Therefore theſe be not Errors, but Truth. Here you ſee again clearly, why this great promiſe cannot belong to your Prelates or other Governours of your Church, as it is different from ours. *Firſt*, Becauſe you had no Viſible Governours at all of your Church as diſtinct from ours. For Governours muſt needs be Viſibly choſen, have Viſible Subjects, ſend forth Viſible Decrees, &c. Name ſuch Governours as theſe different from ours, if you can. You can Name none but ours. With ours then only *the Holy Ghoſt abided* all theſe Ages, *Guiding them into all Truth*. Whence *ſecondly* it follows, that he cannot now be Guiding your Governours into all Truth; they being manifeſtly Guided into Opinions directly oppoſite to thoſe Doctrines, which were all theſe laſt thouſand Years Taught by all thoſe who were Governours of the Church. If you could ſhew Gover-

nours

nours of Churches in all these last ten Ages, still Teaching those points in which you differ from us, without Teaching other notorious Errors; then indeed you might have some colour to Plead, that this Spirit of Truth might as truely have been said promised to the Governours of your Church, as to those of ours: But this promise, not being performed to them (there being no such Persons to be found in those Ages,) was not doubtless promised to them; otherwise *Christs* promise had not been performed.

15. *My twelfth and last Text*, shewing clearly that this promised assistance was extended to Infallibility, is, *Ephes.* 4. Whence appears that the end, and intention of CHRIST in giving the chief Governours of that Church, (which was to be Visible in Ages) was such an end, and such an intention, as could not be compassed by giving us such chief Governours, Guides, and Instructers in Belief, as were meerly Fallible; and who might lead us into circumvention of Error, even then, when they were legally Assembled together to deliver the Truth, from their highest Tribunal, in a General Council. For had all these our chief Governours, even then, been liable to broach gross Errors, vented for Divine Verities, (and pressed upon all to be admitted as such,) how had *Christ* obtained that end for which he gave us these our prime Governours, Guides, and Instructors? For *he gave some Apostles*, (succeeding alwayes in full Apostolical Authority, as we see in St. *Peters* Successors:) *some Prophets* (those saies St. *Thom.* 12. *Rom. v.* 6. Are called Prophets in the New Testament, who expound the Prophetical sayings with that Spirit with which the Scripture was Written:) *And some Evangelists*, (that is Preachers of the Gospel; So *Philip* is called an Evangelist, *Act.* 21. *v.* 8. So St. *Paul* bad *Timothy* do the Work of an Evangelist, *Tim.* 4. *v.* 5.) *some Pastors and Teachers*; whose Offices are more known. But to what end did he give all these? It follows; *For the perfecting the Saints.* How pitifully should they be perfected by Obtruders of gross intolerable Errors for Divine Verities? *For the Work of the Mi-*

Miniſtry; how pittifully alſo had ſuch Men performed this Work? *For the edifing of the Body of Chriſt*: Such Broachers of Errors had been fitter to Work Her Deſtruction. How long did God intend to give all theſe ſorts of Perſons, of which ſome were to be endued with the plenitude of Apoſtolical Authority, and conſequently with an Infallible Authority; How long, I ſay, did God give ſuch to his Church? *Till we all come into the Unity of the Faith*; which will not be untill the laſt daies of all: Wherefore untill the end of the World, the World ſhall be provided. But are we, by being thus provided, ſufficiently ſecured from all Error? The next Verſe will tell you, that this was Gods chief intent; *That we henceforth be no more Children toſſed to and fro, and carried about with every Wind of Doctrine, by ſlight of Men and cunning craftineſs, whereby they lay in wait to deceive.* Gods end then was ſo to provide us of a means, by which we might be ſo ſecured in our Belief, that no Mans craft or cunning might be able *to toſs us to and fro*; as we ſee now all they are, who hold themſelves able to bring *Evidence of Scripture*, againſt all thoſe who for the laſt ten Ages have been Apoſtles, Prophets, Evangeliſts, Paſtors, and Teachers in *Chriſts* Viſible Church.

16. To elude ſome of my Texts, our Adverſaries uſe to ſay; we muſt indeed hear the Church, as long as ſhe teaches what is conformable to Scripture: And ſo long the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt Her; ſo long, and no longer, She is the Pillar and Ground of Truth, and God is with Her, &c. I anſwer *firſt*, That in conſequence to this the Father of Lies himſelf may be believed ſo long as he Teaches conformably to Scripture. *Secondly*, who ſees not how ridiculous it is to ſay; *we ſhall hear the Truth from the Church as long as ſhe does not teach againſt the Truth.* Is this to be the Pillar of Truth? A Straw is a Pillar as long as it bends not, and Quick-ſand is ſure Ground untill it yields. Blaſphemous is the ſenſe which makes *Chriſt* ſpeak non-ſenſe. As all by a Voice from Hea-

ven

ven were bid to hear *Chriſt*, ſo all are bidden by *Chriſt* to hear his Church: Her Governours therefore ſhall never come by unanimous conſent to propoſe Lies for Articles of Faith. For if all ſhould teach a Lie (as every Error againſt Scripture is a Lie) with whom is that promiſe made good, that *the Spirit of Truth ſhould guide them into all Truth.* If we may be miſled by all thoſe Guides which God gave his Church, to the end *that we henceforth be no more Children toſſed to and fro, and carried about*, &c. How ſhort did God fall of his intent in falling upon ſuch Guides as being liable ſo to ſwarve from the Scripture, muſt needs leave us, yea make us, *toſſed to and fro.* Read but over the Texts I cited laſt Section out of the Old Teſtament, and you ſhall ſee how flatly this Interpretation oppoſes Gods Word, *which ſhall never depart from the Churches Mouth, nor Her Seed, nor the Seed of Her Seed*, &c. See alſo my anſwer above, *n.* 7. *Thirdly*, thus you will leave no Text to prove She ſhall never Err in Fundamentals: For you will ſtill be anſwered; that ſo long as in them She Teaches conformably to Scripture, She ſhall not Err in them; But if once in them She Teaches not conformably to Scripture, She ſhall Err even in them; and ſo *Chriſt* ſhall have no Church.

17. Having now ended the compleat dozen of Texts brought partly out of the Old Scriptures, manifeſtly promiſing Infallibility to *Chriſts* Church; partly out of the New, manifeſtly conferring the ſame: I cannot but deſire all thoſe who read thoſe Lines out of a deſire of finding the Truth, that they would ſtay here a while, and examine carefully whether theſe Texts be not clearer, and come not far more home, then thoſe Texts which were the beſt Dr. *Ferne* brought to prove, *that Scripture by it ſelf is ſo our Infallible Judge.* See thoſe Texts examined, *Sect.* 10. See alſo if you have any thing near ſo good Grounds out of Scripture for any of thoſe 24. points, which I have ſhewed to be neceſſary to Salvation, and for which

which consequently you say you have clear Scripture. Confer these with the best you have for the keeping the Sunday, for Baptizing Infants, &c. Which I have here examined; and ask your own Conscience, whether you can be able to give your own Judge a Reason, why you did not hear his Voice, speaking far more home in these Texts, then he did in those? Lastly, I again call upon our Adversaries, to shew *by Evidence of Scripture*, if they can, that these twelve Texts here cited by me, are not capable of that Interpretation which we conformably to our Churches Doctrine, have given them. But still we note that they fall short of doing this, so long as they only shew, that it is possible to invent some different Interpretation of these Texts, from that which we have given them: For so even the Texts which the Apostles have Interpreted out of the Old Scripture, may be shewed to have been capable of other Interpretations, tho' the Interpretation they gave them were very true: You must then shew, and that by *Evident Demonstration*, that the Interpretation which our Church gives them, is not true; or else vain is your boast, that you hear not our Church, because, *you have evident Demonstration of Scripture against Her*; For no less can suffice against so publick Authority, even according to your own Principles.

SEC.

SECTION XVI.

The ſame is proved by ſeveral Reaſons.

1. THe firſt Reaſon, why the Church muſt needs be furniſhed with ſome Infallible means beſides the uſe of Scripture, (which uſe is not Infallible tho' the Scriptures be Infallible,) is taken out of that which I touched upon, (*S.* 10. *n.* 13.) to wit; that there is no Reaſon, nor any one ſingle Text, Teaching that the Church in the Law of Nature, ſhould be ſaid to be Priviledged with Infallibility, above the Church of *Chriſt* in Law of Grace: But the Church in the Law of Nature, which laſted for two thouſand Years, (untill the firſt Writing of Scripture by *Moſes*,) was all that while Infallible in propoſing true Traditions, and not ſo much as liable to propoſe falſe ones. This I prove, becauſe all the Faith which the true Believing People had in thoſe two thouſand Years was Infallible, tho' it relied only on the propoſal of the Church; propoſing ſuch, or ſuch a point as received from God revealing to *Adam*, or ſome other Patriarch thoſe Verities: For example, that they were to obſerve the Sabbath, *Gen.* 2. The diſtinction between clean and unclean Beaſts and Meats, *Gen.* 7. and *Gen.* 9. *v.* 3. *That the Soul is* immortal; that the Rewards and Puniſhments of the next Life laſted for ever; that they were by the fall of *Adam*, conceived in Original Sin; that ſuch, and ſuch Remedies were to be uſed to free themſelves and their Children from it; what Repentance they were to uſe; how faſt they were to ſtand to their Traditions; how they were to accout it a moſt damnable Sin to forſake them, *&c.* This was the Faith of all true Believers in the World, which for two thouſand Years had no

other Ground then the Revelation of God, as proposed by the Tradition of the Church present to all Believers in every Age, in which these Believers lived. And tho' their Tradition was inferior to ours, as I shewed in the place now cited, yet the Church then, in every Age, was Infallible in propounding that which they had once received by Revelation: And the Believers of each Age, resting upon the Infallible Authority which their present Church had in propounding those Divine Verities, *had the same Spirit of Faith*, as St. *Paul* saies, 2 *Cor.* 4. The Misbelievers then had the same Spirit also which they have now in opposing the Churches Tradition. This Spirit, before the Flood, was in *Cain*, who, as *Thargum Hierosolimitanum* saies, *protested to* Abel *that there was no Justice, nor Judge, nor other World then this, nor no Reward for Vertue, nor Punishment for Sin:* And perhaps he used the Argument which Dr. *Ferne* and many now use; that his part was negative, *Abels* affirmative; and so *Abel* was bound to prove what he held: Which because he could do only by Tradition, *Cain* (having the true Misbelievers Spirit) scoffed at all Tradition: His Heresie made the World so corrupt, that few just Men were left at the Flood of *Noe*, altho' this Heresie was strangely opposed by *Enoch*, above four hundred Years before the Flood; whence St. *Jude v.* 11. having said, *Woe be to them for they have gone in the Way of* Cain; adds *v.* 14. *And* Enoch *also the seventh from* Adam *Prophesied of these, saying, behold our Lord comes with his Holy Legions to do Judgment upon all, and to convince all that are Ungodly amongst them of their Ungodly deeds.* After *Noahs* Flood, these Denyers of Gods Judgement being extinguished, *Nemrod* was the second Arch-Heretick, as *Josephus* witnesses *l.* 1. *Antiq. c.* 4. for he Taught, *That Men were not beholden to God, but to themselves for Temporal prosperity;* and thus Heresies, by contempt of Tradition, again multiplied: Yet still God had a Visible Church, holding fast the above named Traditions received from *Adam*, as the keeping of the Sabbath,

bath, &c. And ſome five hundred Years before God gave the firſt Scripture to the Children of *Iſrael* only, he did ſeparate *Abraham* from all other Nations, giving afterwards unto him and his, the Precept of Circumciſion, (*Gen.* 17.) which Precept (tho' no Scripture could be then ſhewed,) was for above four hundred Years obſerved by his Poſterity as a neceſſary Precept. Upon Tradition alſo they believed the Covenant God made to *Abraham* of making him the Father of many Nations; and that the *Meſſias* ſhould be Born of his Seed. Then after *Moſes* his Daies Scripture was Written, but given only to the Children of *Iſrael*: No other Nation being bound to ſubmit to this Law. All other Nations, as they had then ſeveral true Believers among them, when *Abraham* was ſeparated from them, ſo there is not the leaſt mention of their total Decay in Belief, after that ſeparation; all they then ſtill believed what they had believed before, upon the ſame ground as they did before, neither were the Scriptures promulged among them. And thus true Faith might be preſerved among many who never heard of Scripture, untill *Chriſts* time; that is for another two thouſand Years, and more. Juſt ſo true Faith, even after *Chriſts* time, was preſerved among many without any Scripture; as I ſhall by and by ſhew. But to go on; we Read that *Job* and his Friends (when or whereſoever they lived,) lived not among the progeny of *Abraham*; and yet *Job* was moſt eminent in Vertue and true Faith, and his Friends (and probably many of his and their Neighbours) believed in one God, held the Reſurrection of the Fleſh, and that God ſhould Judge all according to their Works, and divers other points, relying ſtill upon only Tradition. Why ſhould the Tradition of *Chriſts* Church be more Fallible then theirs was? As I argued *Sect.* 13. ſee that place, and alſo what I ſaid, *Sect.* 10. *n.* 13. and you will ſee that there is far greater Reaſon why our Tradition ſhould be credited more then theirs. Is not *Chriſts* Church nobler then theirs? Did God give them any means fitter to ſecure

their Traditions from being falsified; then he gave his Church: Could Tradition be an Infallible Ground for above 4000. Years before *Christ*, and can it not have been so ever since *Christ* for 1686. Years. Add also to this, that the Children of *Israel*, tho' they had the Scriptures, yet they had not all necessary points Written in their Scripture, but did rely wholly upon the Tradition of their Church for the Truth of them; as I shewed *Sect.* 10. *n.* 7.

2. *My second Reason*, to prove the Church is provided of some Infallible means for the secure direction of Her Children, is, that not only from the begining of the World, to *Christs* Preaching his New Gospel, the Infallible Faith of several true Believers, had no other Ground but the Infallibility of their respectively present Church, in proposing the Tradition She had received; but also the first true Believers in *Christ* relied in their Faith upon the Infallibility of CHRISTS Church, not having any other Infallible Ground but Her Authority, affirming that She, by Tradition, had received such and such points taught Her by *Christ*, or his Apostles. See what I said in my last *Sect.* *n.* 13. This manner of believing, even our own *Protestant* Adversaries confess to have been Infallible untill the whole Canon of the Scripture was Written, and divulged, which was some 70. or fourscore Years after *Christs* Passion. Now how this manner of security relying upon the Church, which from the begining of the World unto the finishing of the last Book of Scripture and publishing of the same, had been the common practise of true Believers, did presently turn to be Popish, and Unlawful, I cannot perceive: But I am sure all our Adversaries stoutly affirm that it is so; and here their part is affirmative, and affirmative of the Unlawfulness of that which from the begining of the World was ever Lawful unto that day. Wherefore to plead against so long a Prescription (that the World was not capable of a longer,) for introducing a new Obligation of not believing upon a Ground which had been, for above four thousand Years,

able

able to bear all the Faith of the World, *Evidence of Scripture* ought to be brought: What then more Reasonable then to ask of them to cite at least one single clear Text, commanding all the Believers of *Christs* Church to give over relying upon Her Authority, as now never to be any more Infallible after the finishing and publishing of the last Book of Scripture? Our Adversaries cannot bring any such Text affirming this clearly, without we will be pleased to take their Fallible and ungrounded Interpretations to be a Ground sure enough to make the Texts reach home to the Proof of what we demand: Which cannot be allowed by us; because, by their own Confession, their Interpretation is Fallible: And we must have an Infallible Ground to overthrow an Infallible Authority, standing sure even from the begining of the World. Call then, and call again and again; for this Text, and be sure to allow no Interpretation to help the Text to reach home, but such as can by clear Scripture, be shewed to convince that the Text tells you evidently, that after the finishing and publishing of the last Book of Scripture, no Body was ever to rely upon the Churches Authority, now grown Fallible, tho' ever before Infallible. Do but stand close to this, and their vain boast of Demonstrating this by Scripture, will fall down Dead before thy Feet, to be trampled upon by thee. Yea, not to condemn their own Brethren the *Lutherans* (who deny the *Apocalyps* or *Revelations* to be Scripture,) they will tell thee, that for diverse Ages this Book was not known to be certain Scripture, and yet perhaps this was the very last Book of Scripture, untill the publishing of which the Infallibility of the Church was to last. If this be so then, you must allow it probable that the Infallibility of the Church lasts untill this very day, for any certainty we have of the contrary: For your *Lutheran* Brethren will say, that Book of the *Apocalyps* was never as yet sufficiently published to the Church to be Scripture; for if it were so, they neither could, nor would reject it. *Secondly*, it seems inconceptible, how the Writing

and

and publiſhing ſuch a Scripture, as was at laſt written and publiſhed, ſhould without any diſtincter Declaration then the Scripture, by little and little, (that is, as People were pleaſed to Copy it out,) ſhould make invalide the hitherto Infallible Authority of this Church: There being in this Scripture twelve Texts at the leaſt, (as I have ſhewed in the two former Sections,) recommending to all, the Authority of the Church; beſides diverſe others bidding them hold ſtill Her Traditions, and inculcating this over and over again; as I ſhewed *Sect.* 10. *n.* 9. Traditions do not grow weaker, but ſtronger, by being witneſſed alſo by Writing; and the more Authority the Writing has, the more ſtrength is added to the former Tradition: For example, we know by Tradition there is ſuch a place as the *Indies*, where Gold is to be found; but when our own Fleets come to go thither, and fetch the Gold from thence, and in Teſtimony thereof ſtamp Golden Pieces with this Inſcription, *Brought by our Fleet from the* Indies; and when Acts of Parliament come to be ſet forth concerning the value of ſuch, and ſuch Pieces: When I ſay this Golden-Printed Teſtimony comes forth, is not the former Tradition grown rather more, then become leſs credible? So when any of the former moſt credible Traditions come to be now Written in the Golden Letters of the Scriptures, and of ſuch Scriptures as Commanded Traditions to be held; and Commanded again and again the Church to be heard, followed, obeyed, relied upon as the very Pillar and Ground of Truth; is not Her Authority and the credit of Her Traditions rather increaſed, then leſſened, by this Golden and Divine Writing? Again; it was wholly neceſſary that if after the finiſhing of the Canon, the Church was no longer to be Infallible, that notice thereof, by ſome very publick Decree or Act, ſhould have been given to all the People in the Church; that they might not go on grounding their Faith upon the Infallible Tradition of the Church, as they did before; leaſt ſo doing they ſhould rely now, not upon the Pillar and Ground of Truth, but upon a Fal-

Fallible Authority. That this was done you can prove by no kind of Teſtimony.

3. But I can prove, by a moſt grave Teſtimony, that, long after the finiſhing of the Canon of Scripture, the Faithfull Believers ſtill held on their former manner of relying in their whole Faith wholly upon the Infallible Authority of the Church: Juſt as I ſaid before that, when *Moſes* gave the Scripture to the Jews, the Faithful People among the *Gentiles* had not theſe Scriptures, but continued ſtill to believe upon Tradition only, (See my firſt Number:) My Teſtimony is out of St. *Irenæus*, who was Diſciple to St. *Polycarp*, tho' he lived a hundred and fourſcore Years after *Chriſt*. This Saint, in that unqueſtioned Work of his againſt *Valentinus*, *L.* 3. C. 4 Where he ſhews, in what manner we were all to believe the ſame things which now we do believe, altho' there were no Scripture at all; and he ſhews this by ſhewing how, even after the Writing of Scripture, many whole Nations did believe, who had never ſeen the Scripture, by following (as an Infallible Rule) that order of Tradition which had from Hand to Hand been dilivered to the Prelates of the Church; and by them to the Churches of which they reſpectively had charge. For thus he ſpeaks; *What if the Apoſtles had not left us the Scriptures? Muſt we not have followed that order of Tradition which they delivered to thoſe to whoſe charge they left the Churches to be Governed? To this order of Tradition* (by the unwritten Word) *many Barbarous Nations do aſſent, who have believed in* Chriſt *without any Writings, keeping diligently the Ancient Traditions.* Note, that he calls theſe Traditions *Ancient*, becauſe they had ſtood a good while after the finiſhing of the Canon, before which time all Nations believed meerly on Tradition, as I ſaid, and before which time, no one Tradition of Chriſtian Faith could be *Ancient*. Hence then St. *Irenæus* proves, that we might believe with Divine Faith, upon the ſole account of, or meerly relying upon, that very Tradition, which the Apoſtles *de facto* left

to

to thoſe to whom they left the Government of the Church; altho' the Apoſtles had never Written any thing at any time. St. *Irenæus* therefore did believe that the Tradition *de facto* left by the Apoſtles, was a ſufficient ground to uphold Divine and Infallible Faith; and conſequently that it was Infallible: So that upon it meerly, whole Nations might believe: For, if he had not thought that they had believed meerly upon Tradition, but had only by it been recommended to take the Scripture for their ground; he could not hence have ſhewed (to ſhew which he brought this Proof) in what Meaſure we had all been obliged to believe all the points of our Chriſtian Faith, altho' never any Scripture at all had been at any time to be Written; in which caſe it had been impoſſible for our Belief to have had any kind of Relation to Scripture. And becauſe the Belief of theſe Nations had no ſuch Relation, this example was to his purpoſe: Which otherwiſe had not been ſo. Now what St. *Irenæus* ſaies muſt needs in all Reaſon have been true; for the Scripture by the Apoſtles was only Written in Greek, and ſome very few parts in the Hebrew then Currant: A vaſt multitude of Nations underſtood not theſe Languages, as I have ſhewed *Sect*: 1. *n.* 9. neither did the Apoſtles take any care to procure the Scripture to be turned into the Languages of every Converted Nation which had a different Tongue; For had they done So, divers of theſe Tranſlations would either have been for ſome Ages extant, or at leaſt ſome memory of them; whereas there is not the leaſt ſign of any ſuch thing. The Latine Tongue was by the *Romans* impoſed upon moſt of thoſe many Nations, which were Converted in the Apoſtles Age, and the Ages following: Wherefore a Man would think that in the firſt place, or among the very firſt, this Language would have been choſen by the Apoſtles for publiſhing the Scriptures, if the Scriptures had been the only ground to be relied upon in Faith: Yet for all this you will not grant our vulgar Edition (which you grant to be the moſt Ancient of all Latine Editions) to have been ſet forth by any

command given by the Apoſtles, or by any one of their immediat Succeſſors, or to have been approved by them: From hence then we manifeſtly gather, that the Apoſtles eſteemed that very Tradition, which they delivered to theſe to whom they commited the Government of the Church, to be a moſt ſufficient ground to ſupport Infallible Faith: And conſequently they held ſuch Traditions Infallible, leaving them for the only ground of Faith to the far greater part of the Nations which they Converted; to whom they delivered no Scripture at all in their own Tongue, nor left any Command (that can be proved) that Scripture ſhould be (preſently after the finiſhing of the Canon) delivered to them in their own Languages; for had this been done, ſome of their Tranſlations would have been kept. If you ſay they had the Scriptures tho' in Greek only. I anſwer, that thoſe who underſtand not Greek, are never the nearer for having a Greek Book. Why did not St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* (who writ in Greek even to the *Romans* themſelves) at that time they ſtayed in the *Latin* Church, procure or order the Scriptures to be put in Latin; if without grounding our ſelves upon Scripture in every point of Belief, no part of our Belief, which is not ſo Grounded, can be Infallible. And hence clearly and and orderly follows.

4. *My third Reaſon*, That no Man now has any Infallible Faith, but he who relies upon the Tradition of the preſent Church, as an Infallible Ground. This I prove out of what has been by me already Demonſtrated. Firſt, for the moſt Learned ſort that be in the World, they cannot know, by any ground which is Infallible, (except the Tradition of the Church be Infallible,) which Books the Prophets or Apoſtles did Write, which not; as I have ſhewed *Sect.* 3. Nor which be the true uncorrupted Original Copies, which not; as I ſhewed *Sect.* 4. and therefore they muſt rely in theſe two points, (upon which no leſs then all their Faith does rely,) upon the Tradition of the Church as Infallible; for a Fallible Tradition cannot be a ſufficient ground to ſupport an Infallible

Faith: Either then they have no such Faith, or they must allow Tradition to be Infallible. As for those who are not so Learned as to understand *Hebrew* and *Greek*, or who have not means to know which Copies be uncorrupted in *Greek* or *Hebrew*; They must believe this but by meer Humane Authority, if they refuse the Churches Tradition; So by and by *n.* 7. And so for Translations, which be the very prime Conveighers of all that is in Scripture, to those who understand not *Greek* and *Hebrew*; either these Men must rely upon the Word of God, as conveyed unto them by such Fallible Men, as I have shewed their Translators to be, *Sect.* 5. or far more Wisely, they must rely upon the Tradition of the Church as Infallible: And if they do not, their Faith will ever be Fallible, as I have shewed. Again, it is not the bare Letter of Scripture which can be a Rule or Ground of Faith unto us; but it is the sense of this Letter Interprered according to the true mind of the Holy Ghost: Now the private Interpretation, which any particular Mans Wit, or Learning, or Spirit can give to this bare Letter, is Fallible; even tho he shall exactly observe those twenty several Rules of which I spoke *Sect.* 7. *n.* 7. for these Rules are all Fallible; wherefore the bare Letter, taken in the sense that we by our private Wit, Learning, and Spirit imagine, and meerly conjecture it to be taken, is not the Infallible sense of the Holy Ghost; and therefore no ground of Faith, even to those most Learned Men, who are able to use exactly all those twenty Rules. See the place last cited. But as for all that vast multitude which cannot understand perfectly *Hebrew* and *Greek*, it is impossible for them to observe those twenty Rules, (of which one supposes perfect skill in *Hebrew* and *Greek*.) Wherefore it being our Adversaries own Doctrine, that without the exact observance of all these 20 Rules, the Infallible sense of the Holy Ghost cannot be Infallibly known to any one, but only Fallibly: After all that still Fallible Industry, it is a clear Demonstration, that those who know not *Greek* and *Hebrew*, cannot know Infallibly what the

the Scripture bids them do or believe; they not being able Infallibly to know the ſenſe of the bare Letter, which ſenſe (you ſay,) is the only Rule and Direction of Faith, and the only Infallible ground upon which all Divine Faith muſt rely. Wherefore almoſt all Man-kind, who is unskilfull in *Greek* and *Hebrew*, muſt firſt have not only the Letter of the Scripture faithfully delivered unto them upon truſt of the Tranſlators; But *Secondly*, this muſt be done after that theſe Tranſlators have made an unqueſtionable choice of ſure uncorrupted Original Copies, (in which choice it is not poſſible for them to proceed, but very Fallibly, as I ſhewed, *Sect.* 5.) *Thirdly*, alſo they muſt have the ſenſe of the Letter delivered truly and aſſuredly unto them. I ask, by whom? You ſay, by your Miniſters. Then (ſay I,) you rely upon the Wit, Skill, and Spirit of thoſe Miniſters. Is this proved Infallible? No. How then is your Faith Infallible? As for us, we rely upon the unanimous Tradition of thoſe Governours of our Churches, to whom the Apoſtles with that charge, delivered all the important points of our Faith, as well by Word of Mouth, as by daily practice anſwerable thereunto: Commanding them to deliver to all in their Churches (among whom were their future Succeſſors,) the ſame points both by Word of Mouth, and by the anſwerable practice, juſt as they had received. In like manner their Succeſſors ſucceſſively were directed and commanded to proceed. No Writing (as I ſhall ſhew *Sect.* 19. *n.* 4, 5, &c.) can with ſo full aſſuredneſs, bring down to our Age, what was Taught and practiſed in the firſt Age, as perpetual Tradition of the ſame Doctrine, confirmed by the continuance of the ſame practice firſt received, & never able to be ſhewed to have been altered or changed. Upon this Tradition we are ſure that we believe as groundedly, at the leaſt, as all the true Believers did for the firſt two thouſand Years before any Scripture was Written. And as groundedly as all the *Gentiles* (for only *Jews* had the Scripture,) believed at any time afterwards. And as groundedly as the *Jews* believed ſtill ſome things only upon Tradition;

for example, what remedy was to be uſed to take away Original Sin from their Female Children, or from their Male Children, Dying before their Circumciſion on the eight day: And again, as groundedly as thoſe many Nations, Converted by the Apoſtles Succeſſors, believed after the Scripture was finiſhed; tho' they never had ſo much as ſeen Scripture; but wholly relied, in their whole belief, *upon the Ancient Tradition received from them, from whom the Governours of their Churches had Originally received their Governments and Authority;* to wit, from the Apoſtles; as I ſhewed out of *St. Irenæus.* Tradition then of theſe Governours of our Churches, delivered unanimouſly by them, makes the points ſo delivered now as evidently credible, and as fit Objects of Divine Faith, as it made the points delivered then by their Governours or Paſtors; Wherefore we have as good Reaſon now, to take what is thus propoſed for Truth revealed by God, to be indeed ſo; and conſequently to be embraced with ſo firm and immoveable adheſion of underſtanding and will; that the Preaching of the contrary by an Angel from Heaven ſhould not ſtagger our belief therein: And we have as good Reaſon to proceed thus in our belief, as all thoſe I ſpoke of, had to proceed ſo in their Belief.

5. *My fourth Reaſon* hence deduced is, that *Chriſt* himſelf expects and exacts an Infallible aſcent of Faith to be given to any point, which is confirmed by Miracle from Heaven; and ſuch an aſcent has a ſufficient ground to ſupport its Infallibility. *Chriſt* calls theſe Miracles, *a Teſtimony greater then John, Mark* 5. Yea a Teſtimony (in order to us) greater then his own Word; *If you will not believe me, believe my Works.* He calls that a kind of ſure knowledge which is grounded on the Teſtimony of a Miracle; So *Matth.* 9. v. 6. *But that you may know that the Son of Man has Power on Earth to forgive Sins, he ſaies to the Man Sick of the Palſie: Ariſe, take up thy Bed, and go into thine Houſe.* You ſee *Chriſt* uſed the Teſtimony of this one Miracle, as ſuffi-

cient

cient to make *them know* the Truth of his having Power to forgive Sins. Miracles then ground a ſure knowledge of Faith or an Infallible aſcent to what they confirm: But the Tradition of the Church makes that which it witneſſes to be as Infallible, and as evidently credible in order to us, as this cureing of the Man Sick of the Palſie, or any ſuch Miracle can do; Therefore this Tradition may be as ſolid a ground of an Infallible aſcent, as a Miracle: I prove it clearly thus. Let any Man ſpeak as he thinks in the ſight of God, and he will plainly confeſs, that to be moſt true which I am going to ſay, I ſay then, that tho' a Man had lived in the Country all his Life, and never had ſeen *London*; yet he (meerly upon the Teſtimony of Tradition,) would ſo fully believe that there is ſuch a City as *London*, and that it is the Head-Town of *England*: That neither I, nor you can prudently conceive how the Teſtimony of any one Miracle (wrought on purpoſe to prove that there is ſuch a City as *London*,) ſhould make it more evidently credible unto him, that there is ſuch a City, without the Teſtimony of any Tradition; then Tradition has made it without the Teſtimony of any Miracle: Whence you ſee Tradition wins Belief as Powerfully as any Miracle. True it is, this Tradition we ſpoke of is but Humane, and ſo be the motives of Credibility making it evidently credible that God, by his Apoſtles, affirmed ſuch or ſuch a point unto the firſt Believers of the Church. But when it is once made to me as evidently credible that God has revealed ſuch and ſuch Vereties, as it is credible by Humane Tradition that there is ſuch a City as *London*, then preſently (by the Grace of God) I conclude; that it being ſo credible that God has ſaid ſuch, and ſuch a thing, that I cannot in prudence, no more doubt that he has ſaid it, then I can doubt there is ſuch a City as *London*: I being thus aſſured, am by my Duty to God bound to yield that ſubmiſſion of my underſtanding to this ſaying of God, which is fit to be yielded to the Word of a God, which Word cannot (without Blaſphemous Impiety) be held ſubject

to

to the leaſt Fallibility. And therefore, what by Tradition is made ſo evidently credible to me, to have been revealed by God to this Church; ought to be accepted by me, as the Word of God. Whence I ought to account it Blaſphemous Impiety to doubt of the Truth of it, and conſequently I ought to hold it Infallible, and as far from all poſſibility of being falſe as Gods Word is. And being that this very ſelf ſame Tradition tells me, that the ſame God, who revealed by his Apoſtles ſo many other Verities to his Church, did alſo reveal, by the ſame Apoſtles, to the ſame Church, that this Church was to be heard as the Miſtriſs of Truth, with whom he would ever be preſent, ſuggeſting Her all Truth and never permiting the Gates of Hell to prevail againſt Her; but that he placed Her as a Pillar and Ground of Truth; giving Her ſuch Paſtors as ſhould ſecure Her Children from being toſſed to and fro, with every Wind of Doctrine: Being (I ſay) this very ſelf ſame Tradition, which made it evidently credible unto me, that God had revealed many other Verities to his Church, had alſo (together with them,) revealed this Verity of Her being Infallible in propoſing any point for Divine Faith; and being that I did ſee with my Eyes, that She did propoſe Her Traditions for Verities received from God, it could not but be evidently credible unto me that God had revealed the Infallibility of his Church, and conſequently the queſtionleſs Truth of Her Traditions. Wherefore I yielded that ſubmiſſion of my underſtanding to this ſaying of God, which was fit to be yielded to the Word of a God, which Word I could not without Blaſphemous Impiety ſuſpect to be any way lyable to Fallibility.

6. Here, by the way, out of what has been now ſaid, we may eaſily clear two common difficulties. The firſt is, how we do commit no vicious Circle in our Faith: For tho' firſt we believe the Scripture to be Gods Word, becauſe the Church, which is Infallible, told us ſo: Yet, when again we are asked, why we firſt believed the Church to be Infallible? We do

do not ſay (as our Adverſaries would needs make us ſay, whether we would or no,) that we firſt believe our Church to be Infallible, becauſe the Scripture told us the Church was Infallible; But we anſwer, that we firſt believe the Church to be Infallible by Her Tradition delivered Her by the Apoſtles before any Scripture was made; which Tradition makes things ſo evidently credible, as I have juſt now declared, that even a Miracle wrought purpoſly to confirm ſuch a point, makes not that point more evidently credible. Tradition therefore is a ground able to ſupport an Infallible aſcent. Well then, I believe *Chriſt* to have been Crucified, becauſe the Scripture ſaies ſo: I believe the Scripture, becauſe the Church by Her Tradition ſaies the Scripture to be Gods Word; I believe the Church and Her Tradition for its own credibility. If you ask me why I do ſo? I anſwer, becauſe I will do prudently in a matter of ſo great conſequence; that is, I will ſubmit, and I will captivate my underſtanding in ſuch manner, as to yield all firm aſcent, which (by God his Grace) I poſſibly can do, unto that, which the Church by Her Tradition propoſes unto me as Gods true Word; upon which Word my underſtanding ſhall be fixed ſo immoveably, that no *Angels* Words ſhall move me from it: See *Sect.* 23. *n.* 5. 6. Hence you ſee to what my underſtanding cleaves ſo faſt; to wit, to Gods true Word propoſed by the Church, or Her unanimous Tradition. Now if you ask me; why my will is ſo reſolute in making choice of thus ſubmiting, and thus Captivating my underſtanding? I eaſily anſwer; becauſe my underſtanding has evidently ſeen, (I do not then go Blindly to Work, as our Adverſaries conceive we all do, *Sect.* 8.) Becauſe my underſtanding has evidently ſeen, that, even according to all Reaſon, Prudence, and Piety, it is moſt Unreaſonable, Imprudent, and Impious, not to yield this ſubmiſſion of underſtanding to that which is evidently credible to be Gods Word; and that to the full as that which is confirmed by Miracle: For what is affirmed by the Churches unanimous Tradition, is no leſs evidently credible

then

then what is confirmed by Miracle, (as I proved in the very laſt Number;) Therefore, (and in many other reſpects) it is moſt Unreaſonable, moſt Imprudent, and Impious, not to yield all poſſible ſubmiſſion of underſtanding to that which is propoſed as Gods Word, by the unanimous Tradition of the Church. It is madneſs not to believe what is made evidently credible, even then when Heaven is offered unto me if I will believe it, and when Hell is Infallibly to be my Puniſhment, if I will not believe it. For ſo our Saviour himſelf ſaid, when Men had only Tradition to rely on, (to wit, before any Word of that New Scripture was Written,) *He that Believes and is Baptized, ſhall be Saved; but he that Believes not ſhall be Damned.* (*Mark* 16. *v.* 15.) And many were Damned for not Believing the Church, before either the Old Scripture was Written in the Law of Nature, and before the finiſhing of the New Teſtament, in the firſt ſeventy Years after *Chriſts* Paſſion; and after the finiſhing of it alſo, many were Damned for not Believing among thoſe Nations to whom the Faith without any Scripture was ſo well propoſed, that thouſands of them were moſt true Believers, meerly grounding their whole Faith upon the Church, and Her unanimous Tradition.

7. The *S*econd difficulty (which may eaſily be cleared by what has been here ſaid) is, how the Ignorant vulgar ſort come to embrace our Faith, and all the points of it, with an Infallible aſcent, and that prudently? Whence will appear that Tradition is the fitteſt Deliverer of certain Truth, and the moſt proportionable to the Capacity of the incomparably greater part of the World. For no Man, who is above the Degree of a Fool, is ſo Ignorant, but by ſuch carefull ſearch, as all are bound to uſe in finding out the way to their laſt end (which is Eternal Salvation;) he will preſently find, that the unanimous Tradition of our preſent Church propoſes ſuch and ſuch points to be believed as being points revealed by *Chriſts* Apoſtles to the Church, for example, *the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Death and Reſurrection of our Saviour, his having planted*

upon

upon Earth an Infallible Church for our Direction, &c. Then having found this to be the unanimous conſent, and Tradition of our Church, he may eaſily be made capable how evidently credible that is which is propoſed by the Tradition of ſuch a Church. *Firſt*, becauſe all thoſe who believed for the firſt two thouſand years, did believe all that they believed upon a weaker Tradition then this is, as I diſcourſed before: *Secondly*, he may alſo eaſily underſtand how true it is which I ſaid *n.* 5. that no Miracle can move a Man ſo effectually to believe that there is ſuch a place as *London*, as Tradition does move him thereunto: Wherefore as Miracles can beget an Infallible aſſent, ſo alſo may Tradition. *Thirdly*, he can underſtand that the Churches Tradition is ſecured by God from deceiving us; for elſe all the Faith of thoſe Millions and Millions (to whom God gave no other ground but this to ground that Faith which he, under pain of Damnation, exacted of them) might have been an Error; and could not have been Infallible, as he exacted their Faith ſhould be. Now all this being moſt true, and being alſo a real propoſal of what is indeed revealed by God; (which it is not when any falſe Church uſes this Argument;) God can, and will concurr with this Ignorant Man, as well as with any Doctor, to raiſe him by ſupernatural Grace to an Infallible aſſent to the Truth, which he embraced moſt prudently upon Reaſons proportionable to his Capacity; which Reaſons do really make the Verities which he believes to be firſt evidently credible to him. His Faith may then be truly Infallible, tho' he knows not that it is Infallible; for this knowledge is no way neceſſary, even in Learned Men, as I ſhall ſay, *Sect.* 23. Now among our Sectaries, Ignorant Men can never embrace the points of Faith with an Infallible aſſent. For they muſt embrace not point with ſuch an aſſent, but when the Scripture, not taken according to the bare Letter, but taken as Interpreted truly, tells them that ſuch a point is true. But I ask, how it can ever be made evidently credible to them, that ſuch a place of Scripture is truly Interpreted in that ſenſe,

but especially seeing that the greatest *Protestant* Doctors teach that the true sense cannot be found out but by observing perhaps twenty Rules; of which they are by them plainly told, that they cannot observe diverse, as I noted just now, *n.* 4. whence it is clear they may and must despair of finding amongst you any true ground fit to support an Infallible assent. This your own prime Doctors did easily see, and knew not how to deny. Hence *Whitaker* de Sacra Scriptura Q. 5. C. 9. *Rightly, because the unskilful know not rightly to use these means* (of consulting the Hebrew and Greek Originals,) *they must go to those who are more skilful:* So he. And your great Divine *Baronius* in Apodixi P. 47. *The Unlearned Lay-men cannot have a certain, and explicite, and distinct knowledge of the Scriptures, and of the Doctrine contained in the Scriptures, or that the Translated Bible agrees with the Original Edition. Yea, they do not know but by the Testimony of others, that the Doctrine which is proposed to them to be believed, is contained in this Bible.* And again, P. 48. *They only by Humane Faith believe that the Doctrine which is proposed to them, is contained in the Bible.* So he. You then, who are not perfectly skilled in Hebrew and Greek, are taught by your own Doctors, that is is impossible for you to believe, but upon trust and relyance on the Authority of some more skilful. Do you not know evidently these on whom you rely, to be Fallible? Yes. Why then know you not evidently that your Belief, amongst *Protestants*, can never rise to be Infallible, nor so much as evidently credible, *even* to the Ignorant; For they are sure that, as your Ministers say, such and such *Protestant* Doctrine is evidently by them deduced out of the Word of God; so they are sure that a far greater and learneder number of the present Age, and all the whole numberless number of those who lived these last ten Ages before your Reformation, who were Men most Vertuous and most Learned, did unanimously affirm the quite contrary Doctrine to be conformable to Scripture, rightly understood. And this they know by

by your own Confeſſion: For you never deny that Popiſh Doctrine was the Currant Doctrine of all Chriſtians theſe laſt thouſand Years, excepting only ſuch Chriſtians as were notorious Hereticks, or ſome few others who make no number at all fit to appear in the view of ſo many Millions of Millions, as theſe ordinary Lay-men know to have moſt conſtantly embraced the *Roman* Faith; and with a vaſt multitude of Books, to have moſt learnedly maintained the Doctrine flatly contrary to yours, to be the more conformable to Scripture; in which they lived with far more Sanctity then now you do: Why then ſhould I now forſake that, which is alſo confirmed (as you acknowledge,) by many great Councils; and choſe to venture my Soul with theſe new Believers, whom I and every Ignorant Man knows to go to a Church every Sunday, the very Walls of which Church be many Years elder then their Religion: If they will go with us the Old beaten Way, trodden by all Antiquity, and Chalked out by an uninterrupted Tradition from the Apoſtles daies to theſe, they (as Ignorant as they are) may, as I ſaid, eaſily come to ſee, *Firſt*, that they ſhall have as ſure ground for all their whole Belief, as all true Believers had the firſt two thouſand Years before the Scripture was Written. *Secondly*, they ſhall ſee they have as ſure a ground as all true Believers (the *Jews* at the moſt excepted) had for thoſe two thouſand Years following, before other Nations had the Scripture. *Thirdly*, they ſhall ſee that they have as ſure ground as all Chriſtians are confeſſed to have had the firſt ſeventy Years before the New Teſtament was finiſhed and divulged. *Fourthly*, they ſhall ſee they have as ſure ground as thoſe many Nations had, who believed all that other Chriſtians did; and believed it with as true a Divine Faith, tho' they never did ſee Scripture: As I ſaid even now out of the moſt Ancient Doctor St. *Irenæus*. So that they ſee that the ground of their Belief has been a moſt ſure ground of true Divine Infallible Faith for above more then four thouſand Years, to wit, a good way down-ward after *Chriſts* time. *Fifthly*,

they ſee alſo that the laſt thouſand Years, which was juſt before your Reformation, all thoſe vaſt multitudes, whom you confeſs to have followed *Popery*, to have ſtill believed on the ſame ground, relying on the preſent Church as Infallible; Therefore from *Chriſts* time to the Reformation, they ſee only a wonderful ſhort ſpace of Years, in which ſpace you ſay all refuſed to rely in their Belief upon the Church: What is this ſpace to be compared to that almoſt whole ſpace of time which was from the begining of the World to this Reformation: In all which vaſt ſpace all Faith of all Men relied on the Church as Infallible. Again, (as ſimple as I am,) I underſtand this evident Argument, that in the thouſand Years juſt before your Reformation there were many Councils, many Learned, and many very Holy Men; (for they ſay that then Men generally rather lived better then now.) Now theſe Councils, theſe great numbers of Learned and Holy Men, could not but ſee the Truth of thoſe matters which are clearly and plainly ſet down in Scripture; and even the *Proteſtants* themſelves Teach that all neceſſary matters are clearly and plainly ſet down in Scripture: I therefore neither have Charity nor Wit, if I ſay that they then could not ſee the Truth, ſo manifeſtly clear in ſuch points; wherefore upon good Reaſon in thoſe points I will agree with the *Roman Catholicks:* But now for thoſe points which are not clear in Scripture, I will alſo not diſagree from them; becauſe, in things confeſſedly not clear, you are likelier to miſunderſtand Scripture then they: And they (beſides Scripture) give me that excellent ſure ground of the Tradition of the Church, which has been a ſure ground for ſo many thouſand Years; and queſtionleſs is a ſurer ground then truſting you; I will then in theſe points truſt them, and not you. And ſo you ſee why I reſolve in all points to truſt the Church. But all this is ſpoken by the Way: Now let us go on.

8. *My fifth Reaſon*, for the Infallibility of ſome means in the Church ſufficient to ground Divine Faith, and yet diſ-

fering

fering from Scripture, is this: God has given us ſome means ſufficient to come to the Faith neceſſary to Salvation (as has been proved *Queſt.* 1.) But this means is not the Scripture, (as I have ſhewed in the twelve firſt Sections;) neither is it Natural Reaſon (as I ſhewed *Sect.* 13.) Therefore the means which now actually is given us by God, is the Infallible Direction of the Church; there being not the leaſt appearance of probability for any other means which God has given us, tho' he might have given us other means, if he had pleaſed.

9. *My ſixth Reaſon* is that, whatſoever was held by the Univerſal Church, was without further queſtioning, held for true; and the contrary to it was ever rejected as an Error: Two manifeſt Signs of Infallibility; both which will appear ſufficiently proved, when I ſhall come to cite the Fathers Authority for the Infallibility of the Church; *Sect.* 20. 21. 22. and you know already St. *Auſtens* ſaying in the End of his Book *de Hæreſibus*, that tho' he tell you not in particular, what the Church has defined againſt every one of thoſe ſeveral Hereſies, yet ſaies he; *Sufficiat eam contra iſta ſentire, It is enough* (to make us fly them as Hereſies) *to know that the Church holds the contrary.* Neither will you ever find any Catholick who ever had the boldneſs to ſay, that all the Church of his daies did Univerſally hold any thing that was an Error: And their Works were conformable; for never ſhall you read of any Catholick (much leſs of any Holy Father,) who refuſed to conform himſelf to the Univerſal Belief and practice which was Current in the whole Church of their times: Your *Luther* and *Calvin* had not their Spirit. Here I intreat you to Read the Authorities which hereafter I ſhall bring out of the Fathers, and you ſhall ſee the ſenſe and feeling which Sacred Antiquity had in this point, ſee my *Sect.* 20. &c. How cloſe in all Interpretation of Scripture (on which all depends) Antiquity did ever ſtand to the Church, I have ſaid *Sect.* 7. n. 9. out of *Vincentius Lyrinenſis.*

10. *My Seventh Reaſon is that*, without the Church be pro-

provided of some other Infallible means to direct us to the Truth, besides Scripture; there will never be any Unity and Agreement in the Church, in necessary points of Religion. For I have already fully shewed that Scripture alone (tho' submitted unto by all sides) does not produce this Verity, even in necessary points: For I have numbered up 24 such points not so much as contained in Scripture. Hence I frame this Argument; under pain of Damnation all are bound to agree in this one thing, that all and every one interiorly gives an Infallible assent to all such points, as are necessary to be believed for the attaining of Salvation; because all are bound to please God, and consequently to have that Faith *without which it is impossible to please God:* But all can never be brought to agree in this one thing (that all and every one of them interiorly gives an Infallible assent to all such points, as are necessarily to be believed for attaining Salvation) without all and every one submit their assent to some other Infallible Rule besides Scripture; for submitting to Scripture only does not produce this Union, as so long and so Lamentable experience has Taught us: Neither can the Scripture alone suffice for this end, being it does not so much as contain 24. of such points as are all necessary to Salvation: Therefore all can never be brought to agree in that one thing (in which under pain of Damnation they must agree,) without they all and every one interiorly give an Infallible assent to some other Rule of Faith then the Scripture: No other, with any appearance of Reason, can be thought of, but the Direction of the Church; Therefore Her Direction is this Rule. But if Her Direction be this Rule, Her Direction must needs be Infallible; and this for two very manifest Reasons. *The first is*, that it is impossible all should be (as they are) bound under pain of Damnation to follow this Rule, if this Rule could Guide them into Error: Because it is impossible God should Damn Men, for not following so foul an Error as this is, which makes them Father

as

as many Lies upon God as they believe Errors to be Divine Verities. *The second Reason is*, because all (as I said) are bound interiorly to give an Infallible assent to all such points as are proposed by the Church: But it is impossible to give an Infallible assent, grounded upon a ground which is not Infallible (as it is clear:) Therefore seeing that the ground, upon which their Belief in these points must rely, is only the meer Direction of the Church; it evidently follows that Her Direction is Infallible. Why I defer to answer the Objections against the Infallibility of the Church, and some other things: I shall presently tell you.

THE

THE FOURTH AND LAST QUESTION.

Which is that Church which is the Infallible Judge in all Controversies?

How She exercises Her Infallible Judgement? And what submission is due thereunto?

1. HItherto we have, only in General, declared the Church to be our Judge, and to be provided of some Infallible means (besides Scripture,) to guide and direct us in Faith: Not intermedling with other important, but more particular doubts; untill we had gotten sufficient Principles solidly established, to proceed to these particulars with more clear and distinct knowledge. By the Church, we have hitherto understood that Blessed Congregation of People which followed the Doctrine of *Christ* and his Disciples, still propagating the Doctrine delivered to them from Age to Age, untill we come to our Age. But, because there be a number of Congregations pretending to be this Blessed Congregation; we must see in particular, in which of them we can find this Infallible means to end all Controversies, and to direct us securely in all points of Faith. *Secondly*, we must see in what particular manner this particular Blessed Congregation does Judge all Controversies; and how She directs us

us in particular in all our doubts of Faith. When we have found theſe two things, we ſhall ſoon ſee the laſt thing we ſeek for, *to wit*, what particular ſubmiſſion is due from all, that they all may be ſecurely directed in that Faith which leads to Eternal Salvation: The end for which we all were Created; and conſequently at which all our moſt ſerious endeavours ought to aim.

2. And becauſe we now ſhall come to ſpeak of the *Roman* Church, and to ſhow how ſhe in her General Councils, propoſing unto Her ſelf the Word of God, as well Written, as Unwritten, does iſſue forth Her Definitions, Decrees, and Orders, by which ſhe Directs us: We only now can clearly diſpatch ſome things, which very properly belonging to the laſt Queſtion, but could not be ſo commodiouſly treated there, becauſe they required a more diſtinct knowledge of the queſtions to be handled here. Here then we ſhall ſolve the Objections againſt the Infallibility of the Church, which our Adverſaries uſe to make againſt the Roman Church in particular; and therefore they were to be treated here. Here alſo we muſt anſwer many things they bring againſt Councils; and when we declare how Councils propoſe to themſelves Gods Word Written, and Unwritten, we muſt add ſomewhat more of Tradition then has yet been ſaid; anſwering what elſe they object againſt it. And becauſe the Teſtimonies of the Holy Fathers, confirming the Infallibility of the Church, do ſometimes ſpeak of Her Infallibility in General; ſometimes they ſpeak of the *Roman* Churches Infallibility in particular; ſometimes how Infallible General Councils are; ſometimes how Infallible the Unwritten Traditions of the Church are (which meerly rely on Her Authority:) We have thought good to place their Teſtimonies after that we have treated of all theſe particulars: Which are linked together with ſo neceſſary connexion one of another; that the Proof of the one, is the Proof of the other.

SECT. XVII.

Whether the Roman Church *be that Church which is our Infallible Judge?*

1. BY the *Roman* Church we do not underſtand the particular Dioceſs of *Rome*: But we underſtand, that vaſtly extended Community of Chriſtians which holds Communion with the Church of *Rome*, ſubmiting themſelves to the Biſhop of *Rome* as to their Head; ſo that whatſoever he Decrees with a General Council, they embrace as the Definition of the true Church, which they hold Infallible. This is *the Flock of* CHRIST *adhearing to the true Sheepherd* appointed by him; as I ſhall ſhew *Sect.* 20. *n.* 6. Wherefore when you come now in particular to ſee into what we reſolve our Faith, when we ſay that we rely upon the Church as Infallible; you ſhall find that it is reſolved finally into the Authority of God propoſing ſuch and ſuch things to us to be believed by this his Church: Whoſe mind is made known unto us, partly by ſuch Traditions as Univerſally go Currant in Her, and are moſt notoriouſly known, not only to be permitted, but alſo to be on all occaſions unanimouſly taught by Her Prelates; and partly by ſuch Definitions, and Decrees, as the Prelates of the Church, Lawfully Aſſembled by Order of, and together with their Head, do ſet forth; of which manner of Government we ſhall ſpeak in the next Sections.

2. We then conſtantly affirm, the *Roman* Church thus underſtood is our Infallible Judge in all our Controverſies of Faith, and appointed by God to be ſo. The Proof of this is eaſily and demonſtratively performed, ſuppoſing the Truth of all that has been ſaid and proved in the laſt Queſtion; in which

which, both out of the Old and New Teſtament, I have brought moſt convincing Teſtimonies, to prove that God has appointed ſome Church upon Earth to be our Infallible Judge. The ſame I proved by ſeveral Reaſons in the laſt Section. So that we do not, without full proof, ſuppoſe that God has appointed ſome Church upon Earth to be our Infallible Judge. This then (upon good Proof) ſuppoſe; we eaſily Demonſtrate this Church appointed by God for our Judge, to be the *Roman*, and only the *Roman Church*: We do it thus. The *Proteſtant* Church, and all other Churches different from the *Roman*, do Judge, do Declare, and profeſs themſelves to be Fallible, even according to the Infallible Word of God: If then the Proteſtant Church, or any other Churches different from the *Roman*, be Infallible in all that they Judge, and in that they declare and profeſs to be true even according to the Word of God, they doubtleſs are then Infallible, and ſpeak then the Infallible Truth, when they Judge and declare and profeſs, that even according to the Word of God, they are Fallible: Therefore Infallibly they are Fallible. Hence again, it being thus proved, that no Church different from the *Roman* is Infallible: And it being formerly proved that God has appointed ſome Church upon Earth to be our Infallible Judge: It Demonſtratively follows, that the *Roman* Church muſt needs be this Infallible Judge; becauſe no Church different from the *Roman* (that is, none but the *Roman*) can be this Infallible Church; as my former Argument proved. Some of our Adverſaries are pleaſed fondly to miſtake this Argument, as if we argued thus; the *Roman* Church claims Infallibility: Therefore She muſt needs have right to it. This Argument we give our Adverſaries free leave to ſcoff at, as much as they pleaſe; it is nothing like ours: We put all the force of our Argument in this; that the Church, truly appointed by God for Infallible Judge of Controverſies, cannot poſſibly be any of thoſe Churches which teach themſelves not to be this Infallible Judge; becauſe they teach themſelves to be Fallible.

If then they be Infallible in the Doctrine they teach, they are Infallible when they teach themselves to be Fallible: Whence it follows that Infallibly they are Fallible. The Church which is truly appointed by God to be Infallible Judge, must needs have this condition; that she does own Her Infallibility: But this is far from saying; that meerly the owning of Infallibility does make Infallibility her own. It is a very different thing to say, *he that must be a Minister, must needs be a Man, and not a Woman:* And to say, *that such an one must needs be a Minister because he is a Man, and not a Woman:* So it is one thing to say, the Church which is the Infallible Judge, must be a Church Judging, and holding, and professing Her self to be Infallible; and cannot be a Church which Judges and professes Her self to be Fallible: And another quite different thing to say; that such a Church is the Infallible Judge, because She teaches and professes Her self to be so.

3. Others have in exceeding plenty alleadged other Arguments which may be seen in them: This one being a Demonstration serves my turn; and this one being put alone, I hope my Reader will more mark the force of it.

SECTION XVIII.

In what Court this Infallible Judge decides our Controversies in Faith.

1. OUr Adversaries would make the World believe (as may be seen in Dr. *Fernes Sect.* 17.) that they have a great advantage against us, when they put this Question to us; for by putting it they conceive they put us at Variance with one another: Because some will say, *First*, the Pope can

can Infallibly by himſelf, out of a Council, decide all Controverſies; others will ſay, *Secondly*, that a Council can do this without a Pope. But I muſt tell them that, *Thirdly*, all and every one of us (without the leaſt diſagreement) do and will unanimouſly ſay, that all thoſe Definitions declare an Infallible Truth, which are ſet forth by the Pope defining together with a General Council. Any one way of defining Infallibly is enough, and is ſufficient to end any Controverſies. Yield but to this one way, and we will preſs you no further. If you will not yield to the Pope defining jointly with a Council, we are ſure enough that you will neither yield to Pope alone, nor Council alone. If God has provided us of one way, which is a ſure and Infallible way to know any neceſſary point of Faith, and to keep us all in ſettled Unity, concerning all matters declared by this Infallible Authority, (ſuch as we all hold this Authority to be:) It is impoſſible that we ſhould want neceſſary Direction, or a ſufficient means to maintain that Unity which is neceſſary for the Church, or that Guidance which is neceſſary for our Salvation. If their Opinion be true, who ſay, the Definition of the Pope alone is ſufficiently Infallible to do this without a Council; theſe Men furniſh us with two means of neceſſary Direction: For they do not deſtroy, but maintain the former; Becauſe no Man is ſo ſenſeleſs as to hold the Definitions of the Pope to be Infallible without a Council, and to be Fallible with one. So alſo no Man is ſo ſenſeleſs as to ſay, that Councils Definitions are Infallible without a Pope; and that they are not Infallible when Councils define together with the Pope. But theſe Men who ſay, Councils defining even without a Pope, are Infallible, do alſo add a third means of Infallible Direction. The one means I ſpeak of is allowed by every one: And this one means is ſufficient for every one: You ſee then, this diſagreement gives you not the leaſt advantage to deny the Infallibility of the *Roman* Church, as long as by this Name we underſtand continually either this Church ſpeaking by Univerſal Tradition,

on, or the Church Repreſentative, by which we underſtand the Biſhop of *Rome* our Supream Paſtor defining with a Lawful General Council. The Infallibility of the Church, thus underſtood, is a point of Catholick Faith: The other be Opinions of Catholick Divines, all who agree in the exacting the Belief of the Infallibility of the Church, taken in this ſenſe as we ſtill take it.

2. If you ask us then, not our Opinions, but our Belief: (I pray mark this diſtinction:) We all unanimouſly agree, that the Supream Biſhop of the Church, or Pope, defining with a General Council, is the Infallible Judge of Controverſies. And it cannot ſeem ſtrange to any Chriſtian, that the ſame God who gave an Infallible aſſiſtance to *Salomon* (who proved an Idolater,) that the Church might enjoy the benefit of his Books, ſhould give either the Supream Paſtor of the Church, or the Church Repreſentative, for that particular time, his Infallible aſſiſtance, that all the Church might enjoy ſo great a benefit as is the ſecure Direction in all points of Faith, and the perpetual Preſervation in Unity of Faith, not to be had ſufficiently by any other means that is given unto us. Yea, who can chooſe but think it ſtrange, that *Chriſt* for the ſecure Direction of all the firſt Chriſtians, Converted only in the Apoſtles daies, ſhould give this Infallibility to all and every one of the Apoſtles; and that he ſhould regard ſo little the ſecure Direction of all that infinite number of Chriſtians, who were to be Converted after the Apoſtles times to the very end of the World, that for their ſakes, and for the ſecure Direction of their Souls, and their Preſervation in Unity of Faith, he would not give this Infallibility ſo much as to one only Man? No, nor to the Church Repreſentative in full Council, even for that ſhort time in which they are to paſs their Decrees concerning the moſt important affairs in Chriſtendom? Eſpecially ſeeing that on the one ſide, this Guift of Infallibility is given, not for their private ſakes to whom it is given; but it is given for the Univerſal Good, and neceſſary

Di-

Direction, Concord, and perpetual Unity of the whole Church: And on the other ſide, that, even now after we have Scripture, the neceſſity of this Infallibility is ſo great, that our Adverſaries with Dr. *Ferne*, *Sect.* 17. do confeſs, *That ſuch a Judge or Umpire of Chriſtendom* (as a Council indued with Infallibility,) *would (if to be had) be a ready means to compoſe all differences, and reſtore Truth and Peace.* Is it then ſtrange that God ſhould give ſo neceſſary a Guift, or a Guift ſo beneficial to his Church?

3. Having now, by all ſaid in the former diſcourſes, proved that the Church Diffuſed, or Univerſal, was furniſhed by God with ſome Infallible means, beſides Scripture, to direct all ſecurely in Faith, and to preſerve them in Unity, by the true Deciſion of all their Controverſies: We have found already enough to perſwade any Prudent Man, to ſeek after the particular manner by which this means is to be appliable, and Serviceable unto him. Now this is eaſily underſtood by that manner of Government which we had here in *England*, from the Conqueſt to our daies; according to which, all the Decrees and Ordinances, by which we were Governed or Directed, were to be made by a Lawful King jointly with a Lawful Parliament. This Repreſentative, and their Decrees, be called the Decrees of the Kingdom. Juſt ſo, the particular manner by which the Church Diffuſed or Univerſal is Directed and Governed, is by a Lawful Pope, as Supreme Paſtor, jointly with a Lawful Council: And this Aſſembly is called the Church Repreſentative, and their Decrees be called the Decrees of the Church. This way you ſhall find to have been very Connatural to the Church: For it was impoſſible, that the Church Univerſal or Diffuſed, ſhould be Aſſembled for the making the Decrees. And tho' Children and Women belong to the Church; yet all eaſily ſee, that the Church Government belongs not to them: Neither is their Vote (in any Mans Opinion) required for the Deciſion of Controverſies in Faith: We ſay alſo, that the Laity has no deciſive Voice in

this

this point: They be Sheep, and not Paſtors. Every inferior Clergy-Man, is not a conſiderable Governour in the Church: This Government then belongs to ſuch as are Prelates, Overſeers, and Governours over the reſt, *Biſhops placed by the Holy Ghoſt over all the Flock, to Feed (or Govern) the Church of God*, *Act.* 20. *v.* 28. For not Lay-Magiſtrates, but only Eccleſiaſtical, are ſaid, *(Eph.* 4.*) To be given us by* CHRIST *for the Work of the Miniſtry, for the Edifying the Body of* CHRIST, *that henceforth we may not be carried about with every Wind of Doctrine*, &c. It was not to a Lay-Magiſtrate, but to a Biſhop, to whom *Chriſt* ſaid, *Feed my Sheep*, *Jo.* 21. *v.* 15. It is worth the Readers Knowledge to relate here (out of *Rufinus L.* 10. and *Caranza* his *Summ*, juſt before the Council of *Nice*,) how the firſt General Council was Aſſembled in the daies of the firſt Chriſtian Emperor *Conſtantine the Great*. *Rufinus* then, having related how the Hereſie of *Aerius* growing up to the ruin of Chriſtendom, *Conſtantine the Great*, *ex ſententia Sacerdotum*, by the advice or Judgement of the Prieſts, did call together, *Epiſcopale Concilium*; a Council of Biſhops, to Judge of the Propoſitions and Queſtions of *Aerius*. Behold their Power of Judicature acknowledged by their calling, and coming, and ſitting: For thy were called, did come and ſit, for no other end, but to end Controverſies by their Judgment. And then he tells, how theſe Biſhops begining to give up in Writing Complaints againſt one another to the Emperor; he, putting all thoſe Papers in his Boſom, without ever opening or looking upon them, ſaid to the Biſhops; *God has appointed you Prieſts, and given you Power even to Judge of us alſo; and therefore we are rightly Judged by you: But you* (ſpeaking of them as whole Council) *cannot be Judged by Men: Wherefore expect only the Judgement of God upon you; and that your Complaints, whatſoever they be, may be reſerved to the Examine of God. For you are given us by God, as Gods* (that is Judges in his place;) *It is not convenient that*

Men

Men ſhould Judge the Gods: But he alone of whom it is Written; (Pſal 82.) *God ſtands in the Congregation of the Gods He Judges among the Gods.* *Conſtantine* having ſaid this; he Commanded all thoſe Papers to be burnt: And, when now the Sentence of the Council, defining that the Son of God was Conſubſtantial to his Father, was brought to him, *Ille tanquam a Deo prolatam veneratur, &c.* that is, *He did reverence this Sentence as pronounced by God himſelf; and if any one ſhould offer to go againſt it, he proteſts he will baniſh him as a Man going againſt the Divine Statutes?*

4. Behold here how the Decrees of Councils ought to be Reverenced *as Divine.* Hence St. *Athanaſius in Epiſt. ad Epiſcop. Affricanos*, after this ſelf ſame Definition, ſaid, *The Word of God by the* Nicæan *Council does remain for ever and ever.* Hence St. *Horſmida c. ſic ille Diſt.* 58. ſaies, *We believe that in them* (the Fathers of this Council) *the Holy Ghoſt did ſpeak.* Hence St. *Cyrill* (in the Council of *Epheſus* to 1. Ep. 1.) ſpeaks thus of theſe Fathers of the Council of *Nice; They, leaſt they ſhould ſwarve from Truth, being inſpired by the Holy Ghoſt, (becauſe it was not they which did ſpeak, but the Spirit of God, and the Father who did ſpeak in them, as* Chriſt *our Saviour proteſts,) have ſet forth the Rule of pure and unblameable Faith.* So he; and the *Parentheſis* alſo is his. His alſo be theſe Words; *How can it be doubted but that* Chriſt *did preſide inviſibly in that Holy and Great Council?* Epiſt. ad *Anaſtas: Alexandrinum*, St. *Leo* (whom I ſhall cite by and by,) ſaies, that what this Council defines, *it did Seal by the Holy Ghoſt.* St. *Iſidore*, in the Preface to his Collection of Canons, not only recommends what the firſt four Councils have defined, but ſaies alſo of the Decrees of other Councils, *that they ſtand firmly ſettled in all Vigour, which the Holy Fathers, full of the Holy Ghoſt, have eſtabliſhed.* Mark how common it is to aſcribe the Decrees of the Councils *to the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt*, to whom to aſcribe any thing that might be an Error,

is a great Sacriledge. Alſo St. *Leo*, *Ep.* 84. *ad Anaſt.* calls the Canons of the Holy Fathers, *made by the Spirit of God, conſecrated by the reverence given to them by the whole World.* And *Ep.* 73. he ſaies, *the Council of* Chalcedon *was Aſſembled by the Holy Ghoſt, that their Definitions were a Rule proceeding from Divine Inſpiration.* Hence St. *Ambroſe* ſpeaking of the Hereticks condemned by a Council, *Lib. Deſide ad Gratianum*, *c.* 9. *They were not condemned by Humane Induſtry, but by the Authority* (more then Humane) *of thoſe Fathers.* For as St. *Greg. Nazian.* ſaies in his Oration to St. *Athanaſius*; *The Fathers of this Council were gathered by the Holy Ghoſt.* He had the ſame Spirit that the other St. *Gregory* the Great had, who ſaid; *I do profeſs my ſelf to reverence the firſt four Councils, as I reverence the four Books of the Goſpel: And in the ſame manner I reverence the fifth Council. Whoſoever is of an other mind let him be an Anatheme.* Li. Epiſt. *Ep.* 24. *prope finem.* And the very ſelf ſame he ſaies again, *Lib.* 2. *Indict.* 11. *Ep.* 10. *ad Sabinum.* And *Juſtin* the Emperour, before him, made this ſaying Famous by Inſerting it into the Law *Authenticarum Collat.* 9. *de Eccl. tit. c.* 1. *We receive the Doctrine of the ſaid* (four firſt) *Councils as we receive the Holy Scriptures.* Unleſs perhaps *John the ſecond*, (Biſhops of *Rome*) who Lived and Died in the daies of this Emperour, (*An.* 532.) *Epiſt. ad Liberium Severinum*, &c. gave occaſion to this ſaying, by theſe following Words ſpoken of the firſt four Councils; *This is the Ground of our Faith; this is the moſt firm Rock of our Belief.* Behold how he relies on the Councils, as St *Paul* ſeemeth to teach, when he calls the Church, *The Pillar and Ground of the Truth.* From this the Councils are called by Antiquity, *Rules of Faith*, as you have heard already out of St. *Cyril*, and St. *Leo.* So *Vincentius Lyrinenſis*, *Adverſus Hereſes*, ſpeaking of the Council of *Epheſus*, ſaies; Where Queſtion was made *de Sanciendis fidei Regulis*, of *eſtabliſhing the Rules of Faith.* So Caſſiador. Inſtitut. Divin. *L.* 1. *c.* 11.

And

And that no miſtake in the Rules of Faith may hurt you, read over the Councils of Epheſus *and* Chalcedon. Yet more fully ſpoke Pope *Gelaſius*, An. 490. *Epiſt.* 11. *ad Epiſcopos Dardaniæ*, where giving a Reaſon, why after the Definition of a General Council in any point of Faith, that point ought never again to be queſtioned, no, not ſo much as in another Council; for, ſaies he, *otherwaies no conſtitution of the Church ſhould be Stable, if Men ceaſe not to riſe up againſt the Foundation of Truth, contra fundamentum Veritatis ſe attollere*; Calling thus the Definitions of Councils, *the very Foundations of Truth.*

5. When thou ſhalt have Read but this ſmall part of Authorities for the Infallibility of the Church Repreſentative, or Aſſembled in a General Council, thou wilt ſtand aſtoniſhed to Read in ſome of our Adverſaries, that there is no mention at all in Antiquity of the Infallibility of the Church; For thou ſeeſt here, firſt, how Councils are called purpoſly to end all Controverſies in Faith, by defining what is to be Believed by all; that is, what is to be undoubtedly held as a Divine Truth revealed by God. All the Fathers, who Aſſembled to define this, did aſſume an unqueſtionable Authority to their Aſſembly to do this: Upon this Authority they paſſed their Votes, in order to make a Definition of what was to be propoſed to all Men Living then, and ever to live in the Church hereafter; even Curſing and Excommunicating all who ſhould at any time Believe contrary to what they defined: Which had been a moſt Sacrilegious, and Impious, and a moſt unjuſt and tyrannical Act, and the moſt deſtructive to the Church that could be Invented, if, by ſo great an Authority, a Precedent were given, and a wide Gap opened to preſs Errors upon all the World preſent and to come, to be Believed as Divine Verities revealed by God. The moſt Bloody Perſecution of Tyrants could never have been half ſo Pernicious to the Church, as would have been to be compelled by General Councils (that is by the unanimous conſent of Chriſtendom,)

to embrace that as a Divine Verity, which is, in real Truth, a Lye Fathered upon God. Surely a practice ſo Univerſal, ſo frequent, ſo pernicious, ſo notoriouſly publick, would have been cryed out upon over and over again by the moſt Zealous, and moſt Learned Ancient Fathers; who notwithſtanding never opened their Mouths againſt this proceeding of Councils: For thoſe proceedings could not be juſtifiable, tho' thoſe Councils had defined nothing but Truth at the preſent: But ſo, that they had been lyable to define falſity; Becauſe thus they did ſettle forever a Court, which by way of courſe ſhould pertually be called and Aſſembled, for the Definition of matters of greateſt moment, which Definitions under pain of Excommunication were to be ſubmitted unto by all the World: Now if theſe Definitions could be Errors, this was nothing elſe but to take the ſureſt courſe they could Invent, to circumvent all Ages into Incureable Errors. And yet this was the proceeding of the pureſt Antiquity; and this courſe they held the beſt to preſerve purity of Faith. And, as you have ſeen, the moſt Holy Fathers reverenced with higheſt reſpect all the General Councils, which had paſſed before, or in their daies; leaving us example to ſhew the like reſpect to all which have paſſed, or may paſs in our daies. For the Authority given by God is equally given to others as Lawful Councils: To wit, the Infallible Authority of Judging right by the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, ſo often inſiſted upon by the Fathers now cited. Whence it is that, if you Read Hiſtories of all Ages, you ſhall never meet with any Man (held for Catholick) who ever opened his Mouth, I do not ſay to cry down, but even in the leaſt Degree, to call in queſtion the Truth of any thing which he knew to be defined by a Lawful General Council. *What boldneſs then is it, after the Authority of ſo great a Council, that they make new Diſputations and Queſtions?* ſaies St. *Athan.* Epiſt. *ad Epict.* And yet this boldneſs your Doctors allow, when they permit any one to review Councils, to ſee whether they be conformable to Gods Word, as

I ſhewed, *Sect.* 1. *n.* 4. But, as it is ſaid in the Epiſtle of *Julius ad Diaconum Flaccillum*, &c. Regiſtred in St. *Athanaſius* his Apologia 2. *Every Synod has an unviolable Authority, and that Judge is contumelioufly dealt withall, whoſe Judgment by others is again examined.* There is extant in the Council of *Chalcedon*, *Act.* 3. That excellent Edict in which are theſe Words expreſly, declaring that Councils are to end Controverſies: *Let all profane Contention ceaſe, for he is truly Impious and Sacrilegious, who after the Judgment paſſed by ſo many Prieſts, reſerves any thing to be handled further by his own private Judgment.* And yet you will preſume to reſerve the final Review, and the approving or reproving all the Definitions of the Council, by your private Judgment of Diſcretion, if that lead you to conceive that you have clear Scripture on your ſide. He was the chief Biſhop of the Church and preſided by his Legates in the Council of *Chalcedon*, who writ theſe following Words to the Emperour; (*Leo Magnus* Ep. 78. *ad Leonem Auguſtum*, c. 3.) *Concerning the Affairs which have been defined at* Nice, *and at* Chalcedon, *we dare not undertake a new Treaty, queſtioning again thoſe things, as if they were either doubtfull or of weak ſtrength: Which ſo great an Authority by the Holy Ghoſt has ſettled.* What he dared not do, any *Cobler* amongſt you dares venture on. But very truly ſaid *Gelaſius* (whom I cited in the end of the laſt Number,) the doing of this, is the undoing of all Councils; for, *No Conſtitution of the Church ſhould be ſtable, if Men ceaſe not to riſe up againſt the Foundation of Truth;* for ſo he called the Definition of a General Council, almoſt twelve Hundred Years ago. You, who make theſe Definitions Fallible, make them no Definitions; for they never put a final end to the Controverſie, they never do terminate any point: For after their determinations, as if they were no determinations, you call all to your private Review; and there, what you really think fit, your Judgment of Diſcretion (without any Judgment and Diſcretion,) freely rejects and disbelieves.

6. I ſay not this raſhly, for, as St. *Bernard* ſaies in a Sermon upon the Reſurrection; *What greater pride can there be, then that one Man ſhould prefer his Judgment before a whole Congregation.* It is fine Doctrine, that you and I ſhould ſit down, and call to our Examine the definitions and determinations of a General Council. Have we ſuch aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt as Councils have? Have we half the Authority, or any thing like to the one quarter of the Wit or Learning, or Knowledge, or Judiciouſneſs which they have? Let, I pray, us two rather ſit down, and examine how true this is which I ſhall now ſay; Either the determinations of Councils in points of Faith (for of theſe I always ſpeak) be ſuch as are evidently againſt clear Scripture; or elſe the Texts, to which we think the Council to be contrary, be not clear and evident to the contrary; which if they be not, it would be a ſhameleſs Imprudence in you and me, to think we ſhould ſurer hit right upon the meaning of obſcure Texts in Scripture, then a whole General Council (the greateſt Authority in Chriſtendom) has done. But now if the places alledgeable againſt the Councils be evidently clear; do you think to perſwad any Prudent and Pious Man, that this evident clearneſs could not be ſeen by ſo very many, and thoſe ſo very eminent for Piety, and for Prudence, as are known to have ſubſcribed to ſo many General Councils; who could uſe, and are to be Judged to have uſed all the beſt Rules to underſtand Scripture as well as we two. God gave us Humility, God gave us Charity, God have Mercy on us in the bitter day of his Judgement, if we paſs ſo bitter a Judgement againſt the whole Church Repreſentative: And yet if you paſs not this Judgment, you will never paſs this Objection without being poſed.

SECTION XIX.

This Court in deciding Controverſies Rules Her ſelf by the Word of God written and unwritten: And why She Rules Her ſelf by Tradition.

1. IT was a very groſs proceeding in *Calvin*, *L.* 4. *Inſt. c.* 1. *Sect.* 7. &c. *c.* 3. *Sect.* 2. So to propoſe our Doctrine as if we taught, that our Church might define and determine what She thinks fit, without any relation to the Word of God. No leſs groſly did your *Zanchius*, *Tom.* 8. *Tract. de Script. Q.* 3. Go about to perſwade his Reader, that we hold the Authority of the *Roman* Church greater then that of *Chriſt*, and the Goſpel: Whereas we all hold, that every General Council is to examin Controverſies belonging to Faith, according to the Word of God. But, becauſe all Humane Learning, Wit, and Judgment would ſtill be lyable to Error, we ſay; that *Chriſt*, of his goodneſs, has obtained for his Church (thus Lawfully Aſſembled,) ſuch an aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, as ſhall ever preſerve it from Error. True it is, that in Wit, and Judgment, and Learning, ſo great an Aſſembly far excells your private Miniſters: But this aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt is an advantage ſurpaſſing all that is Humane: This aſſiſtance we have proved all the laſt Queſtion, and in the laſt Section we ſhewed, this aſſiſtance given to General Councils.

2. Now to ſee what the Councils on their part are to do; I muſt tell you that their chief buſineſs is to examine the points in Controverſie; hearing all that occurs for the one ſide and the other, and permitting ſeveral replies, if any remain,

main, in due time to be made. After this diligence is used, they consider what seems most conformable to the Word of God, and every ones Vote is to pass upon this particular. But here I must tell you that by the Word of God all Councils, and Orthodox Believers, have ever understood not only Gods Written Word containing in Scripture, but also his unwritten Word made known to the Church by only Tradition; which Tradition also is, and was ever, accounted by the Church the very best and surest Interpreter of the Scripture. The Votes therefore of the Fathers Assembled in Council are demanded, not only of what they think to be conformable to Gods Word Written in Scripture, but also how conformable such a point is, or is not, to that Tradition, which they have all received from the Fathers of their Church, as delivered to them from their Fathers for Gods Word, by Tradition committed to their Fore-Fathers as such, from the Apostles themselves. So for example, if in a Council there does arise a Question, whether we are to Pray for the Dead, or to Adore the Sacrament, or to Confess our Sins to a Priest; the Council askes the Prelates of *Italy*, *Britain*, *Spain*, *Polonia*, *Greece*, &c. What in each one of their respective Nations, so vastly different from one another, has been the Ancient practice and Belief amongst them? And whether at any time such a point was ever said to have been introduced among them as a Novelty? Or contrary wise that no other begining of that practice could be ever heard of then the first begining of Christian Religion? Now when by the unanimous answer of all the Prelates of *Italy*, *Spain*, *Britain*, *Polonia*, *Greece*, &c. It is constantly avered that in all these so vastly distant Nations, Prayer for the Dead, Adoration of the Sacrament, Auricular Confession, were ever, time out of mind, practised, and believed and no time in any one of those Nations can be found, in which this practice and Belief was held to be introduced as a Novelty; but contrarywaies they are, and ever were (as far as they can hear of) esteemed to have been delivered to them

them, together with all the other points of Christian Faith, when this Faith was first planted in each one of those Nations. It cannot but then appear evidently credible unto the Council, that these Doctrines and practices are Apostolical; whence accordingly they pass their Votes to define them. So that when their Votes are past and gathered, *This only, and nothing but this, the* Catholick *Church does do by the Decrees of her Councils; that what before they had received by only Tradition from their Ancestors, that now they leave consigned in authentical Writing to all posterity.* These be the very Words of *Vincentius Lyrinensis*, Adverſ. Hereſies: Neither could I deviſe any fitter for our Doctrine.

3. If you ask, why the Church or Councils esteem so much Tradition? I answer *first*, Because in Prudence and Piety, they cannot but esteem as much Gods unwritten Word, as his written; seeing that the Word of a true honest Man, is as much to be esteemed true, when it is only delivered by word of Mouth as when it is delivered by writing. Your Ministers usually so confound the business, that they make their Auditors even to startle when they tell them, that we hold Tradition equal to Scripture; because first, they have deeply imprinted in their minds, that Tradition is nothing but an old tale set on foot by I know not whom: But if they meant to deal really, they should say what the Truth is; that we do indeed equalize Tradition to Scripture, and that we have all Reason to do so. Why? What is Scripture? Gods Word Written. What is Tradition? The same Gods Word notified, not by Writting, but by the full report of the Catholick Church. I pray now, how do we wrong God, when we say of his Word, what we say of the Word of one, whom we most commend for Truth, that his Word only spoken, and not Written, is as sure, or true, (and consequently as much to be esteemed, and credited) as any Word of his that is written, even with his own Hand. Nay, I pray mark how you wrong God, who slight Tradition, which is nothing but the Word of God unwritten. What wrong is it to an Honest Man, to slight all

he ſaies, unleſs he confirms it by writing? I know the beſt anſwer you have to juſtifie your ſelves, is, That Scripture is aſſuredly known to us to be Gods own Word: But as for our Traditions, you do not know, nor cannot believe that God does own them for his own Word. But give me leave to ask, whence are you aſſured that the Scripture is Gods own Word? Your beſt, and indeed your only aſſurance is, that all the Chriſtian World ſaies ſo: See *Sect.* 20. *n.* 5. That then which makes you, with ſo great aſſurance, know Gods Written Word is Tradition: But the ſame Tradition, which tells us that the Apoſtles delivered theſe points to us as Divine Verities in Writing; tells us alſo, that the ſame Apoſtles delivered theſe and theſe points to us as Divine Verities by Word of Mouth only. If the Tradition of the Church be a Lyar in this laſt part, She may as well be a Lyar in the firſt part. When you believe Scripture, you truſt to Tradition, teſtifying that the Apoſtles gave ſuch and ſuch Books to the Church of the firſt Age to be believed as Gods Word: See two admirable places of St. *Auſten* preſſing this hard, which I cite preſently, *n.* 7. Again, when you believe that the Copies which we have now of thoſe Books, be neither forged, nor corrupted Copies, but do truly agree with the Originals given out by the Apoſtles; you again wholly truſt to the Traditions of all the after Churches that have been in every Age from the Apoſtles to this very preſent Church. For it was as much in the Power of the Church, in any one of theſe Ages, to have thruſt a falſe Copy into your Hand, in place of a true one; as to thruſt a falſe Tradition into the Mouth of every Catholick every where, in place of a true one. Admirably *Tertullian* (de Preſcript. c. 28.) *How is it likely that ſo many and ſo great Churches ſhould Err in one Faith? Among many Events there is not every where one iſſue. The Errors of the Churches* (had there been any in the delivering of theſe Traditions,) *muſt needs have varied*; (for tho' every Man ſhould agree to tell his Child a Lye, yet every one would not agree in telling juſt

the

the very ſelf ſame Lyes:) *But that which amongſt many is found one, is not miſtaken, but* (as a ſure Tradition) *delivered: Audeat ergo aliquis dicere eos erraſſe qui tradiderunt? Dare then any Man ſay that they all Erred who delivered* (with ſuch uniformity) *this Tradition?* So he; holding it, as you ſee, Impudence to ſay this Tradition could be Fallible. Is not this clearly to hold the Tradition of ſo many and ſo great Churches Infallible? Behold here then plain *Popery* in the higheſt point, proved and approved within two hundred Years after *Chriſt*. But more of *Tertullians* Opinion concerning Tradition hereafter, *Sect.* 20. *n.* 4. and much has been ſaid, *Sect.* 12. *n.* 4, 5.

4. My task now is, to ſhew Tradition does convey and bring down Gods Word to as ſure, yea rather ſurer, by perpetual practice, and uniform Doctrine, then by any writing. To ſhew this, I brought many ſtrong Arguments, *Sect.* 10. *n.* 13. and *Sect.* 16. *n.* 1, 2. In both which Sections I have ſaid many things of Traditions: And in the firſt place I ſolved the chief Objections againſt them. But yet I will clear this, and one or two other doubts which trouble many. For clearing then of this doubt, let us take two Traditions, one confeſſed by you to be a true one, the other to be proved by me to be no leſs true then the former, becauſe it is teſtified by as good a Tradition as the former; and therefore either the former is not proved ſufficiently by this Teſtimony, or elſe the latter is. Yet the Truth is (and my Argument ſhall make it good) that both of them be made as credible to be Gods Word by Tradition only, as any Writing by its ſole force could make them. The firſt Tradition which I will, for example ſake take, is the Baptizing of Children; (of which I ſpoke *Sect.* 8. *n.* 3.) The ſecond is of Praying for the Dead. Of theſe two I diſcourſe to my purpoſe thus. Both theſe points (ſay I) were for Divine Verities and practiſes recommended by the Apoſtles to the primitive Church, and ſo from Hand to Hand came moſt undoubtedly delivered down to us. Hence

conformably to this Tradition, every where the Christians Baptized their little Children; every where they Prayed for the Faithful Departed. Nothing more common to all Men then to be Born, nothing more common then to Die, for every one who is Born: Hence, as the daily custome is of being Born, so the daily custome in all the Church, is to Baptize those who are newly Born: And as it is the daily custome for all that are Born to Die; so the daily custome was to Pray for the Dead. But yet Prayer for the Dead was, by more frequent practice, testified in this respect; because those who are Born, are Baptized but once in their Lives: But those who are Dead are many times, and that for many Years after their Death, Prayed for by Name; besides the daily Prayers for all the Faithful departed in general. Well now, let us suppose that both these Traditions be called in question, whether they be Faithful Deliverers of the true Word of God; or rather in place of it, deliver some Humane Invention; as you will say, Praying for the Dead is; and the *Anabaptists* will say, that Baptizing of Children is. Let us now further see, which of these two Traditions cannot defend it self from Forgery, as well as any Scripture questioned of being true Scripture: For example, the *Apocalyps* or *Revelation*, which your *Lutheran* Brethren hold not to be true Scripture. How will you defend the *Apocalyps*? You can say no more then I have said, *Sect.* 3. *n.* 12. for all our Canon in general; and the Tradition upon which those Councils received the *Apocalyps*, had more contradiction, then ever Prayer for the Dead had. For the *Apocalyps* was not only rejected by the most Ancient Hereticks, the *Marcionists*, the *Alogians*, the *Theodotians*; but also by divers Ancient Catholicks, (especially the *Grecians*; as St. *Jerome* testifies *Epist. ad Dardanum*.) But Prayer for the Dead was contradicted by no Catholick at all: Amongst Ancient Hereticks, *Arius* indeed did contradict it; but this is noted in him as a peculiar Heresie of his own Invention, both by St. *Austen* (whose Words

I gave you *Sect.* 8. *fine*,) and St. *Epiphanius*, *Hereſie* 75. ſaies this, *Arius had an Arian wicked Spirit againſt the Church*; and then he denounces againſt him; *that Prayers do profit the Dead.* And the ſame *Saint* there ſaies, *the Church does this neceſſarily* (this is his Word) *by the Tradition received from Her Anceſtors.* And he not long after (*Hereſy* 77.) does profeſs, *that every Man falls into ſtrange inconvenientes, if he will but once paſs the bounds ſet him by the Holy Church, and leap over the Hedges of Traditions.* He held therefore Prayer for the Dead ſutable to the Doctrine of the Church and Tradition. And as for St. *Auſten* (chap. 1. *de cura pro Mortuis agenda.*) He ſaies, *that the Univerſal Church did ſhine with this cuſtome of Praying for the Dead at the Altar.* The greateſt Doctors of the Church could not be Ignorant of a cuſtome *ſhining in the Church*, not particular, but Univerſal. And it is this *ſhining of this cuſtome* which I preſs, and not St. *Auſtens* Authority, otherwaies then as a Witneſs of this *ſhining Tradition.* He alſo *Serm.* 32 *de Verbis Apoſtoli*, (which place *Bede.* 1 *Theſ.* 4. almoſt a thouſand Years ago cited out of St. *Auſten,*) ſaies this; *By the Prayers of the Holy Church, and by the wholeſome Sacrifice, and by the Alms which are given for their Souls, it is not to be doubted but the Dead are helped: So that our Lord deals more Mercifully with them, then their Sins have deſerved.* Why is not this to be doubted of? It follows, *Becauſe this delivered down from our Fathers, the whole Church does obſerve.* See St. *Chryſ.* Teſtimony of this Tradition in the next *Sect. n.* 4. And this Tradition is that which I now ſtand upon, which, indeed did ſhine in the practice of the Primitive Church. You ſhall not find one Liturgy, or Service Book, uſed in the Ancient Church, which is not Witneſs of this Tradition; tho' theſe Books were found in every Pariſh of Chriſtendom in which Divine Service was almoſt daily ſaid. *Tertullian*, (who Lived within leſs then a Hundred and Fifty Years after the Canon of Scripture was finiſhed,) does number up this

this cuſtome of Prayer for the Dead among the Ancient Traditions: *De corona milit. c.* 3. It is ordinary in Law (for Proof of long Poſſeſſion,) to find Witneſſes Teſtifying what was done not only Fifty, but alſo three or four ſcore Years ago: Wherefore even two or three handings of this Tradition by ſuch Aged Hands, would reach down this practice from St. *John the Evangeliſts* time to *Tertullian*. And it is but a ſmall allowance to a thing Teſtified to be a Tradition, to allow it three or four Deſcents, (can the Authenticalneſs of the *Apocalyps* be better proved,) going upwards to the Apoſtles, then this? I am ſure Baptiſm for Children cannot. Again, in both theſe points it is a moſt ſtrong Argument (and as ſtrong for Prayer for the Dead as for the other,) that no time can be named in which theſe cuſtomes began: No Man can be thought of, who could by Humane means (and ſuch means as ſhould not make a mighty Noiſe amongſt thoſe great Reverencers of Tradition,) draw all the World, in ſo ſhorta time after the Apoſtles, to follow cuſtoms as Apoſtolical which then, that is, in that Age in which they were firſt Vented, were evidently, by every Man, not only known, but clearly ſeen to be new hatched Novelties; and not Ancient and Apoſtolical Traditions. This Man who broached this falſe Doctrine ſhould have been put in the Catalogues of Hereticks by St. *Epiphanius* and St. *Auſten*: Whereas they did not only not put him down for an Heretick, but they both did put down *Arius* for one, becauſe he Taught the contrary. Now if you ſpeak of theſe cuſtomes, going down-ward, untill the Age in which they began to be denyed by *Anabaptiſts*, or *Proteſtants*; Prayer for the Dead has come down with ſuch a full Stream, that it drew all Countries in all Ages with it; in ſo much that every where (but among a few late Born *Arminians* and *Albigenſes*,) the publick Service Books in all Pariſhes of all Countries can be as ſure Witneſſes of this cuſtome, as the Copies of Age after Age can Teſtifie we have the true Copy of the *Apocalyps*: And ſo Old Rituals will Teſtifie (tho'

not

not ſo fully,) Baptiſm of Children, by Witneſſing the Ceremonies obſerved in ſuch Baptiſms. And, as for Prayer for the Dead, the very Stones cry out in all Old Monuments, for our Prayers for thoſe who lie interred under them. The Oldeſt Foundations be thoſe, which our greateſt Grand Fathers made (as appears by the moſt Ancient Records,) for the obtaining Prayers for their Souls: And this not in one Country; but there is not one Country which abounds not with ſuch Monuments, and ſuch Records; the very ſtrongeſt Proofs of aſſured Antiquity and unqueſtionable Tradition.

5. Thus I hope, I have made good, that Tradition ſhining in perpetual practice in all times, and all Ages, is a ſurer Relator and Reporter, then a Teſtimony in Writing; which, if Ancient, muſt alſo have the prime Teſtimony (witneſſing it to be uncorrupt) from Tradition. And hence alſo you clearly ſee, that Scripture, true or falſe, can be no better known to be ſo, then true Tradition from falſe: For if Tradition could be falſe in any point ſo Univerſally Currant; it might bear Witneſs to a falſe Scripture, and deny due Approbation to many true ones.

6. When then we are demanded, how we can know a true Tradition from a falſe one? We anſwer, firſt; that we can do this better then you can know true Books and true Copies of the true Books of Scripture, from falſe: For; before you can do either of theſe, you muſt firſt know true Tradition from falſe; that hence you may, not conjectural, but aſſuredly ſay; *Theſe be the true Books of Scripture; theſe be the true Copies of theſe true Books; becauſe true Tradition recommends them for ſuch: Theſe be falſe Books, or falſe Copies of true Books; becauſe the Tradition, which recommends theſe, is falſe.* Tell me the means by which Infallibly the true Tradition in this point may be known from the falſe; and that very means I will aſſign to know in other points, true Tradition from falſe. *Secondly*, I ſhall ſhew, that we have better means to do this, then all the World had

to

to know their true Traditions from falſe, for the firſt two thouſand years, before the time of *Moſes*. Thirdly, I anſwer directly, by aſſigning this means; which is, when a doubt begins to be far ſpread in the Church concerning any Tradition, to call a General Council, and there, by the examination inſtituted by Men moſt knowing of antiquity in general, and particularly well verſed in the received, and approved old cuſtoms of their Countries. For the Countries of thoſe in the Council being ſo far diſtant, and ſo wholly independent one of another, cannot poſſibly have all of them received, and that without any known oppoſition in any one of them, one and the very ſelf ſame Tradition, from any other hands but from thoſe, from whom they received their whole Faith and this particular Tradition for part of it. For, had the begiuers and ſowers of this Traditions now queſtioned, been after the firſt Planters of our Faith, there would in ſome Country or other, be found out ſome Author of this firſt Tradition; there would be ſome fame good or bad, of that Man who was able to perſwade a Fanſie of his own, to be Apoſtolical Doctrine; and to be firmly held ſo by all the World, without oppoſition in any part thereof, even tho' this Tradition (as you ſay of moſt of our Traditions) had a direct oppoſition to the Ancient Doctrine of the Apoſtles. Which Doctrine, when our Traditions were held for Apoſtolical, was too too freſh to be ſo ſoon forſaken, and that ſo eaſily, and ſo generally, without any oppoſition. Now when then the graveſt Prelates from all parts of the World aſſembled, having inſtituted an exact proceſs of the true antiquity and univerſality of the Tradition queſtioned, and in this proceſs found an unanimous conſent of all kind of Teſtimonies from all corners of the World; it is now juridically and notoriouſly made evident, that ſuch a point has come down to us by a true Tradition; and for that very Reaſon is a true object of Faith, being the Word of God delivered by as Faithful a Meſſenger, as the very Copies of Scripture are. And thus, when it was grown doubtful in the Church,

whe-

whether ſuch and ſuch Books were part of the true Canon of Scripture; the Tradition which recommended theſe Books was was examined in the third Council of *Carthage*, in which St. *Auſten* was preſent, and there (as I ſhewed *Sect.* 3. *n.* 12.) all the Books of our Canon (ſo different from yours) were found to be recommended to the Church by a true and Authentical Tradition: And therefore we imbrace them as the Word of God; Tradition being as credible a Relatour of Gods Word delivered by the Apoſtles to the Church, as any writing.

7. Whence again you need not wonder to ſee that by us and by the Fathers cited in the next Section *Numb.* 4. Tradition is equalized Scripture, for this is nothing elſe but to hold that the Word of God delivered by Tradition is as ſure a Meſſenger as any Writing can be, and is to be believed, as much as the Word of God delivered by Writing, and ſuch a Writing as has no ſure witneſs of being Authentical then Tradition. Hence St. *Auſten* (de Utilit. Credendi, *c.* 14.) diſputing with an Heritick, who would firſt have him to believe Scripture before Catholick Tradition, makes the Heretick ſpeak thus; *Believe this Writing.* Then he replies; *But every Writing if it be new and unheard of, recommended by few, no other Reaſon confirming it; we do not believe the writing, but we believe thoſe who bring forth this Writing: wherefore if you* (Lutherans, Calviniſts, &c.) *bring forth this Writing, you being ſo few and ſo unknown* (for where were you theſe laſt thouſand Years before *Luther*?) *I have no mind to believe* you. Now becauſe the Heretick knew not how to preſs St. *Auſten* to give firſt credit to this Writing or Scripture, by ſaying that all of his Religion ſaid it was the Word of God; without preſſing him with the Teſtimony of all the Chriſtian World by Univerſal Tradition: St. *Auſten* prevents him, by telling him; *well you will ſend me to the multitude and fame* (of Church Tradition;) *but I pray rather admoniſh me to ſeek out the cheif leaders of this Multitude, and to ſeek them out moſt diligently and moſt laboriouſly,*

that from theſe, (Governers of the Churches) *rather then from you, I may learn ſomething of theſe Writings: For if theſe Men had not been, I ſhould never have known that there had been at all any thing to be learnt*, (concerning theſe Scriptures) truly in my mind this, not only Authority, but this moſt preſſing Reaſon of St. *Auſten*, convinces that the Governours of this Multitude of all true Believers (eſpecially Aſſembled in one Council together,) be the beſt Guides God has given us upon Earth, both to know which is Scripture, or the true Word of God Written; and which Tradition, or the true Word of God Unwritten: And alſo to know moſt aſſuredly, how this Word of God is rightly underſtood. Wherefore preſently the ſame St. *Auſten (cap. 15.)* does admoniſh us for the avoiding of all Errors, *as the eaſieſt means thereunto, willingly to Obey the Precepts of that* Catholick Church, Precepts made by Her with ſo great an Authority. And then in his ſixteenth Chapter he clearly tells us, that God having given us this Authority, we ought not to deſpair of Infallible means to know the Truth; becauſe this Authority is that very Infallible mean confirmed by Miracles, and by the Miraculous Multitude following it ſo extreamly againſt all Humane Intereſt. Thus then he diſcourſes; *For if the Divine Providence of God does not preſide in Humane Affairs, in vain would ſollicitude be about Religion: But if both the very outward Beauty of all things, and our inward Conſcience does both publickly and privately exhort us to ſeek out and ſerve God, we are not to deſpair that there is ſome Authority appointed by the ſame God, on which Authority we relying, as on a aſſured ſtep, may be lifted up to God. This Authority moves us by two waies, partly by Miracles, partly by the Multitude of its Followers.* Behold here an Authority appointed by God, an Authority, on which we may moſt ſecurely rely, and not only not get a fall (ſlipping into Errors) by leaning upon it confidently; but an Authority, *on which we relying, as on an aſſured ſtep, may be lifted up to God*, who with

with *Miracles* has confirmed this Authority to be moſt ſecure. Whence preſently St. *Aug.* tells us how thoſe Miracles have drawn ſo great a Multitude. But whether this Multitude were *Catholicks* or *Proteſtants*, you ſhall know them by their Fruits. for they *had a Temperance extended to Faſting with Bread and Water, and not only daily Faſts, but Faſts continued for many daies. A Chaſtity diſdaining the having Wife or Children; a Patience, ſlighting croſſes and flames; a Liberality reaching forth to the diſtributing out to the Poor their whole Patrimonies.* Theſe things we ſee ſtill daily among Catholicks; and tho', (as St. *Auſten* adds) *but few do theſe things, yet all People praiſe them, approve them, love them:* None accounted them Superſtitious in thoſe daies. *When we ſee then ſo great hope from God, ſo great profit, and* Fruit, *ſhall we doubt to betake our ſelves to the Lapp of that* Church, *which even by the Confeſſion of Mankind from the Apoſtolick Seat* (ſo Antiquity uſes to call the Seat of the Biſhop of *Rome*,) *by Succeſſion of Biſhops has obtained the top of Authority; Hereticks in vain Barking round about it, but condemned partly by the Judgment of the People* (upon Ttadition,) *partly by the Gravity of* Councils, *partly by the Majeſty of Miracles; to which* Church *not to give the firſt place is truly a thing either of greateſt Impiety, or of head-long arrogancy.* So he. So I. So we all.

8. I have put down the place more fully, becauſe Dr. *Ferne Sect.* 30. would diſprove our Tenets by the deep Silence of them in Antiquity, and particularly in St. *Auſten*, whom I ſhall ſhew alſo preſently, (*Sect.* 21. *n.* 5. 6.) in a dozen places of his Works to hold diſtinctly this Infallibility of the Church in Her Traditions and Doctrine. Well then, She being as Infallible in delivering the Unwritten Word of God, as in delivering the Written Word; the Prelates Aſſembled in Her Councils have as much Reaſon to Ruſe themſelves, and their Subjects by the one, as by the other. By a Writing only we never knew any Common-Wealth Governed. By Tradition

only the whole *Engliſh* Nation has kept our Common Law; which was never Written by the Law-Makers themſelves; yet is made no leſs known by only Tradition then our Statute Laws which were delivered in Writing by the Law-Makers. But what ſpeak I of one Nation? The whole Church through the whole World was Governed by Tradition only. For the firſt two thouſand Years; and then partly by Tradition, partly by Writing, it was Governed for above two thouſand Years more; *to wit*, for the ſecond two thouſand Years from *Moſes* untill *Chriſts* time. See *Sect.* 16. *n.* 1. Now from the Preaching of *Chriſt* unto the finiſhing of the Canon, and the divulging of the ſame in ſuch Languages as all Nations underſtood, very many Years paſſed, and all the true Believers in *Chriſts* Church were Governed by Tradition only; See *Sect.* 16. *n.* 2. And whereas ſome of our Adverſaries obſcurely anſwer; *That the Word of God was in ſubſtance before* Chriſts *Church*, which (ſay they) was begotten by it. We reply clearly to them thus: When (ſay we) you ſpeak of the Word of God, which was before Scripture, and which begot the Church, you ſpeak of the Unwritten Word of God; this Unwritten Word is that very thing which we call Tradition. And indeed when you ſpeak of ſuch a Word, as muſt be ſufficient for an exterior and Infallible Direction for ſo many Millions, (as were to be Directed by it in the way of Salvation before the Scripture was all Written, and divulged in ſuch Languages that might make it fit to direct all Nations,) you muſt of neceſſity put this Word of God outwardly expreſſed by ſome means or other, expreſſing it in ſuch a manner, as might be able to produce this effect of guiding whole Millions in the way of Salvation, by an Infallible Belief of all that God has ſaid by that Word. Now (I pray) find me out any Word of God, any where exiſtent before Scripture, in a manner fit for the end I now ſpeak of, except this Word be granted to have wholly exiſted in the Oral Tradition of the Church of thoſe times. You all ſay, Gods Word revealed is the Ground of all Faith. All theſe Mil-

Millions of the true Believers in thoſe Ages had true Faith; therefore they had Gods Word revealed, and revealed in a ſufficient manner to ground Divine Faith. But they had Gods Word revealed by Oral Tradition only; Therefore Gods Word, revealed by Oral Tradition only, is a ſufficient ground to ground Divine Faith; which it could not be, were it not Infallible, in what it delivers for Gods Word; and what is thus delivered, (by being ſo delivered) is a fit Object of Divine Faith, ſuch as they all had in thoſe Ages.

9. This then is the firſt Reaſon why the Church in Her Councils directs Her ſelf as well by the unwritten, as by the written Word of God, becauſe the one is as truly in it ſelf the Word of God, and as ſufficiently notified to us to be ſo by Tradition as the Scripture is notified to be ſo by Writing: For which cauſe Holy Fathers ſtill Taught thoſe things which we know by Tradition only, to be believed and held equally to thoſe things which we know by Scripture. See *Sect.* 20 *n* 4. A ſecond Reaſon why this Church not only does, but of neceſſity muſt direct and govern Her ſelf not by Scripture only, but alſo by unwritten Traditions, is, becauſe Scripture only does not deliver down unto us all points neceſſary for the whole Church, and all the members thereof: As I have at large ſhewed *Queſt.* 2. naming no fewer then four and twenty of thoſe neceſſary points. All theſe points being wholly neceſſary, and Errors being no where more dangerous then in points wholly neceſſary, there does ariſe an unavoidable neceſſity to grant, that the firſt Church planted by the Apoſtles, recieved her neceſſary direction and Infallible inſtruction in theſe points by Tradition only; for manifeſt it is, that they at the firſt received from the Apoſtles all compleat inſtruction in neceſſary points: And again it is no leſs manifeſt, that they received no ſuch compleat inſtruction in Scripture concerning thoſe twenty four points, for then we ſhould be able to find this Inſtruction in Scriptures, which we not being able to do, we muſt perforce grant that they received this inſtruction by by Tradition expreſſed in no kind of Scripture, but ſuch as com-

commanded in general all Men *to hold the Traditions delivered to them*, 2 Theſſ. 2. And that *tho' an Angel from Heaven ſhould teach the contrary or beſides what they received, they ſhould account him Anathema*, Gal 8. And again, *Have thou the Form of ſound Words which thou haſt heard of me*, 2 Tit. 1. 13. And yet again, c 2. *The things which thou haſt heard* (he ſaies not Read,) *of me by many Witneſſes, theſe commend to Faithful Men which ſhall be fit to teach others alſo.* Now as the firſt Age received their neceſſary Inſtruction by being ſent to no other Rule of Faith in theſe neceſſary points then the Tradition of the Church, and by this only were moſt compleatly Inſtructed in Divine Faith; ſo now this preſent Church in all points not clearly expreſſed in Scripture, and alſo in that prime point of rightly Interpreting the Scriptures it ſelf, has recourſe to the Tradition as to an Infallible Rule, able to make all that it Teaches a fit Object of Divine and Infallible Faith.

10. A third Reaſon, why Councils may and ought to propoſe Tradition to themſelves for an Infallible Rule of Faith, is this; Becauſe that Rule muſt needs be Infallible by which only we can be aſſured what the Apoſtles both by writing, and out of writing did teach to the Church: For in their Doctrine Written and Unwritten, all things belonging to Faith are contained; that therefore which Infallibly teaches us this, and is alſo the only thing which teaches us this, muſt needs be the Infallible Rule of Faith: But Tradition is the only thing which teaches us this; *to wit*, what the Apoſtles did teach us both by Writing and by Word of Mouth without Writing; which this Tradition performs by Millions of true Believers of the firſt Age, all taken apart (as Witneſſes uſe to be to find out how well they all agree in their Teſtimony,) and placed in ſeveral parts in the World; many vaſtly diſtant from one another, and yet all delivering the ſame things to thoſe other Millions, who in greater number ſucceeded them in Life, and in delivering the ſame things, in the ſame manner to new Millions

lions of their Poſterity, all conſtantly agreeing in the Teſtification of the very ſelf ſame points, all affirming them to have been delivered publickly in Churches, and greateſt Aſſemblies every where all their Country over; and that ſo very exceeding often, and by ſo very many, and by ſo very divers Perſons of all kind of conditions that it is more poſſible for all Men in the World to fall into a fit of Dancing juſt for a quarter of an hour at one and the ſelf ſame time, without ever agreeing to do ſo before hand; then it is poſſible for all theſe Millions of Men in ſo different Judgments by Nature, and ſo contrary in their Humors, Inclinations and Proceedings, to conſpire thus in one and the ſame ſtory containing ſo many particulars, without that thing had been really and notoriouſly true, which ſo many Millions, taken in ſo different circumſtances, all teſtified unanimouſly to be true. If this does not make it evidently credible that the Apoſtles taught this, I dare ſay that no Miracle which God can do, without forcing our wills, can make this point evidently credible unto us. Neither have we any thing elſe but this Tradition which makes it evidently credible to us what the Apoſtles did teach the firſt Church by Writing, and by ſuch Writings, and by ſuch and ſuch things delivered only by Word of Mouth. Wherefore either by ſuch a Teſtimony as this, or by no Teſtimony at all, we may be induced to believe Infallibly that the Apoſtles did teach ſuch and ſuch things by Word of Mouth, and alſo did Write ſuch and ſuch Books. And it is moſt prepoſterous to believe for this Teſtimony this laſt part, and not to believe the firſt part; yea this is plain contradiction in him who underſtands what he does: For on the one ſide he ſaies, the Teſtimony of Tradition ſuffices to make a thing a fit Object of Divine Faith, ſo that upon this Teſtimony only I may Build that Infallible aſſent, by which I believe theſe and theſe Books to have been delivered by the Apoſtles; and yet I will not believe that the Apoſtles delivered by Word of Mouth the Doctrine of Praying for the Dead, of Baptizing Infants, &c. Becauſe this ſelf

ſame

ſame Teſtimony of Tradition ſuffices not to make a thing a fit Object of Faith to which before I ſaid it did ſuffice, how then come I now to ſay it does not ſuffice, and to contradict my ſelf with the ſame Breath? I end with *Doctor Fernes* own Words, *Sect.* 2. *It is impoſſible that all the Chriſtian Churches which began in and about the Apoſtolical times, and ſo ſucceeded through all Nations and Ages, ſhould be either deceived in what they unanimouſly witneſſed, or agree all of them to deceive thoſe who followed them.*

SECTION XX.

That the Fathers teach theſe Traditions, and the Definitions of the Councils or Church *to be Infallible.*

1. WE muſt firſt correct the Error of ſome Apprehenſions, who do not conceive ſuch Authorities of Fathers to ſpeak home to our purpoſe, unleſs they ſay plainly *the Church is Infallible.* The Fathers did conceive themſelves in their Writings, to ſpeak to Men capable ſo far of Reaſon as to be able to deduce a clear evident conſequence, when they are compeatly furniſhed with the Principles, from which it muſt needs follow. You ſhall not perhaps find a clear place, that ſaies *the Apoſtles were Infallible;* Yet we have evident Principles from whence we deduce that Verity. *Note*, that we now vulgarly uſe this Word *Infallible*, becauſe no Word more fully and briefly expreſſes our mind. The thing meant by this Word, was by moſt equivalent Expreſſions, ſet down to the very full by Antiquity.

2. I will ſhew this clearly by what I have already ſhewed Antiquity to affirm, concerning the Infallibility of Councils, in the laſt Section but one. There you ſhall ſee *Conſtantine* praiſed by Antiquity *for reverencing the Sentence of the firſt* Coun-

til *as if it had been ſpoken by Gods own Mouth*, and puniſhing the Gainſayers of it *Violators of a Divine Law.* Is not this a full acknowledgment of Infallibility? As alſo when St. *Athanaſius* calls this Definition *the Word of* God. Is not the like fully acknowledgment which was ſhewed there to be made by St. *Hormiſda* believing *the Holy Ghoſt to have ſpoken in the Fathers of that Council*, and by St. Cyril affirming them *to have been inſpired by the Holy Ghoſt that they ſhould not ſwarve from Truth having the Holy Ghoſt ſpeaking in them;* and calling their Definitions, *The Rule of pure* Faith, which nothing can be but what is Infallible. The ſame is ſpoken equivalently when he ſaies again, *that Chriſt did preſide inviſibly in that Council* in which the Embaſſadors of the Biſhop of *Rome* preſided viſibly. The ſame is done by St. *Leo* affirming *that to be ſetled by the Holy Ghoſt which was defined by the Council*, and calling the Canons thereof, *made by the Holy Ghoſt or Spirit of God* uſing alſo the like Speeches of the Definitions of the Council of *Chalcedon*, terming them *a Rule proceeding from Divine Inſpiration.* Is not this to acknowledge ſuch a Rule Infallible? What more has been Written of the Apoſtles Doctrine? Divers other ſuch like ſayings I have there given you, out of the Holy Fathers, affirming Lawful Councils *to be gathered by the Holy Ghoſt, and what was done in them not to be done by human induſtry, becauſe the Fathers ſo aſſembled were full of the Holy Ghoſt.* Hence alſo there was ſuch reverence profeſſed to their Definitions *as to the very Goſpels themſelves*, which is to expreſs Infallibility in a ſuperlative Degree: In which Degree alſo I may place the ſayings of thoſe Fathers, who called *the Definitions of Councils, the Ground of our* Faith, *the* Rock *of our Belief*, Rules *of* Faith, *the very* Foundations *of Truth.* All ſuperlative expreſſions of Infallibility, and yet Men will pleaſe to wonder at the deep ſilence of Fathers, concerning this point in which they could never content themſelves to ſpeak in a vulgar manner, but alwayes in ſuch a high ſtrain of Veneration, that

the true Believers might be not only inſtructed to believe, but alſo taught to reverence this Infallibility, as the Communication of the Spirit of Divine truth, as indeed it is; concerning Councils then what we ſaid in that Section containing all this here recapitulated ſhall ſuffice. Remember alſo what *Vincentius Lyrinenſis c.* 4 ſaies *All thoſe who will not be accounted Hereticks muſt conform themſelves to the Decrees of General Councils.* Let us now ſee what they ſay of the Infallibility of Tradition, taking Tradition as it contains what is not Written in Scripture, and yet is neceſſary to be believed or practiſed.

3. This Tradition the Fathers acknowledge Infallible and ſeveral wayes; ſome of them I have ſufficiently inſinuated *Sect*: 12. Where I ſhewed that the Fathers refuſed to ſtand to Scripture only, as to the only Rule of Faith, becauſe all neceſſary Principles for convincing of Hereticks could not be deduced ſufficiently from thence: And conſequently they did hold that there was ſome other Rule of Faith, containing thoſe Principles, to wit Tradition, which could not be this other Rule of Faith, nor furniſh them ſufficiently with ſuch Principles, except ſhe, in delivering of them, were Infallible. There alſo I ſhewed that the Fathers held divers points neceſſarily to be believed or practiſed; for which they profeſſed themſelves to have no Scripture, but only Tradition: Therefore they held this to be a ſufficient ground of Faith. There alſo I ſhewed that they held divers points to be Damnable Errors, which they know to be contrary to no Written Rule, therefore they thought it was ſufficient to hold them for damnable Hereſies, only becauſe they were contrary to the unwritten Rule of Faith, which we call Tradition, which if it were a Fallible Rule, it might be gainſaid without falling into the damnable Sin of Hereſie, of which Sin the gainſayers of it are, for this only Reaſon accuſed by the Fathers. I have alſo *Sect*: 16. *n.* 3. ſhewed, how manifeſtly St. *Ireneus* teaches the unwritten Rule of Tradition (and ſuch Tradition as was really in the Church then exiſtent) to be a ſufficient Rule, and ground

ſo

for Divine Faith and conſequently to be Infallible. In the very laſt *Sect. n.* 3. I gave you *Tertullians* plain Words condemning them who ſay, *The* Church *can Err in Her Traditions.* But of *Tertullian*; See *Sect.* 12 *n.* 4, 5. In the next number following I gave you two clear places out of St. *Epiphanius* for our obligation to follow theſe Traditions. Going on to the ſeventh *Numb.* I gave you not only a convincing Authority, but an unanſwerable Argument of St. *Auſtens* for the Infallibility of the Church in Her Traditions; whoſe Authority he teaches to be appointed by God that there may be ſome ſufficient Authority *upon which, Men relying, as upon a well aſſured ſtep, may be lifted up to God;* and he holds it *a headlong arrogancy* not to rely upon it: Which had been moſt inconſideratly ſpoken, had it been only Fallible, all this is already diſpatched; let us now proceed to the full Confuſion of theſe who complain of ſo deep ſilence in this point of Infallibility, and becauſe *Dr. Ferne Sect.* 24. Saies, the Authorities cited by *Bellarmine* come not home, I will begin with ſome Authorities taken out of him, which I ſhall ſhew to reach abundantly home to our purpoſe.

4. St. *Denis*, Diſciple to St. *Paul*, *c.* 1. *Eccl. Herarch.* ſaies; *Thoſe our firſt Captains of Prieſtly Function* (to wit the Apoſtles,) *did deliver to us the chiefeſt and ſuperſubſtantial points partly in Written, partly in unwritten inſtitutions.* So that, part of the chiefeſt, and conſequently part of the neceſſary and Fundamental points, were delivered to us in unwritten Traditions only. If therefore this Tradition be only a Fallible Rule we have no Infallible Rule to rely upon in all points neceſſary; becauſe *part of them* muſt rely upon unwritten Traditions only. St. *Iuſtin* in the end of his ſecond Apology for the Chriſtians, among theſe unwritten Traditions places ſome things made neceſſary by Apoſtolical Precepts; *As the conſecrating of Wine mingled with Water; and that it is Lawful to no Body* (tho' never ſo Contrite for his Sins) *to receive the Euchariſt before Baptiſm.* Is not this neceſſary? And yet what Scripture

have you for it, and where find you in clear Scripture that the Apoſtles were Baptized before they Communicated in the laſt Supper of our Lord? There follows the Authority of *St. Ireneus*, which I have ſhewed to reach ſo home, that the whole Faith of whole Nations may be Divine and Infallible by relying only upon Traditions, even long after the finiſhing of the Canon of Scripture St. *Chr.* upon *2 l h.2. It is manifeſt that the Apoſtles did not deliver us all things in Writing but many things without any writing*: *And theſe* be worthy of *the very ſelf ſame Faith.* Good *Mr. Doctor* is that, which is Fallible, *worthy of the ſame Faith* which that which is Infallible is worthy of? He held then Tradition as Infallible as Scripture; of which I have given you a clear Reaſon, *Sect.* 9. *Num.* 3. *Theophilact* and *Oecumenius* upon the ſame place of St. *Paul* deliver juſt the ſame Doctrine. Of St. *Epiphanius* I have ſpoken already. And *Bellarmin* recounts how angry *Brentious* is with him for ſaying; *that it is by Apoſtolical Tradition known to be unlawful to Marry after a Vow of Virginity.* It is neceſſary to avoid that which is Damnable. Wherefore to all who have made ſuch Vows, the knowledge of this point is neceſſary Tradition therefore delivers ſome neceſſary points: Hear St. *Epiphanius* his Words (Hereſie. 61.) *It behoves us alſo to uſe Tradition becauſe all things cannot be had out of* Scripture. *The Apoſtles delivered ſome things in Writings, ſome things by Traditions; as* St. *Paul ſaies, according as I have delivered unto you.* And in another place; *So I teach, ſo I have delivered to the Churches. The Holy Apoſtles of God then have delivered that it is a Sin to Marry after Virginity decreed;* to wit, by Vow. Beſides what I have cited out of *Tertullian* already, he is much to be inſiſted upon in his Book *de Preſcrip*: Where c 19. he very diſtinctly notes; that firſt of all, before ever you enter into diſpute with Hereticks out of the Scripture, you muſt diſpute theſe following points: *From whom, by whom, when and to whom that diſcipline was delivered by which we were made Chriſtians? And there aſſuredly will be found the*

Truth

Truth of Scriptures the Truth of their Interpretation, and the Truth of all Chriſtian Traditions. Mark here how the firſt ground, upon which we are to ſtand, as upon a ground moſt advantageous; for gaining the Victory againſt Error, and purchaſing Triumph to Truth, is Tradition; for by that alone, and no poſſible way but by that, we aſſuredly know *from whom* (to wit from *Chriſt* ſending his Apoſtles) *by whom* (to wit by the Apoſtles) *When* (in the time of their Preaching) *to whom* (to wit to the Churches founded by them) *this diſcipline by which we were made Chriſtians was delivered.* From the Tradition then of theſe Churches as you take the Letter of Scripture, we take alſo the Soul and Interpretation of it conſerved in the daily anſwerable practice firſt Inſtituted by thoſe Apoſtles, and thence by Tradition (as ſurely as by any writing) delivered down by ſucceſſive practice of all ſuch Churches; to which Churches *Tertullian*, in his next Words, diſtinctly expreſſes himſelf to ſend us, for the foreſaid end. And thus (all things being driven to their firſt Source and Origin) will be diſcovered that only Tradition; is in which all theſe Miſteries of our Faith are contained; upon this ground, ſaies he, *I will preſcribe, that what the Apoſtles have Preached ought not to be proved any other way but by thoſe Churches, which the Apoſtles themſelves have founded either by Preaching to them by Word of Mouth, or by* Epiſtle. *And if this be ſo, it is evident that all Doctrine agreeing with the Doctrine of theſe Apoſtolical & Mother Churches is ſutable to Truth, and to be imbraced without all doubt*; (ſo Infallible does this Tradition make it.) And thus *Tertullian* goes on ſtill preſſing his Adverſary, independently of all Scripture, meerly by the Tradition of this preſent Church, ſhewing Her Pedegree from the primative Church: And this way and only this way, he preſcribes that we ought to ſhew what *Chriſt* and his Apoſtles Taught. And in the begining of his Book *de Corona Militis*, his Doctrine comes very home in many things to our purpoſe; As *firſt*, when a Queſtion is asked, why we in this Church (whoſe Pedegree we can draw

from

from the Apoſtles,) do Pray for the Dead? Pray to Saints? Worſhip the Euchariſt, &c. the very asking of this Queſtion, *why do you do it?* proves that we do it. And becauſe we every where do it in the Church, the obſervation of theſe practiſes is to ſtand good, becauſe we are *Habentes obſervationem inveteratam quæ præveniendo, ſtatum fecit. Hanc ſi nulla Scriptura determinavit, certe conſuetudo roboravit; quæ ſine dubio*, &c. *We have an obſervation which by prevention, having got a long ſtanding Preſcription, has ſetled it ſelf. And tho' no Scripture has determinatly appointed this obſervance, yet cuſtome has given it ſtrength: Which cuſtome without all doubt came from* Tradition; *for how can a thing be in practice* (ſo Univerſally) *if it were not at firſt delivered by* Tradition? Now if you ſay, that even for ſuch practiſes, delivered by Tradition, the Scripture muſt be alledged, all his whole following diſcourſe is framed againſt this Objection, and he Muſters up a number of things, then obſerved by the Church (that is in the firſt two Hundred Years,) without any Proof of Scripture, by the meer and ſole Title of Tradition. Thus much is very Home Mr. *Doctor;* as alſo that among thoſe moſt primitive obſervances he places, *Offering for the Dead*, and the even *wearing out our Fore-Head with making the Sign of the Croſs at all kind of Works we begin:* And tho' a Man may be Saved who does not practice theſe things, yet they being Apoſtolical Inſtitutions, how can a Man be Saved who contemns them? *It was not in vain* ſaies St. *Chryſoſt.* Hom. in Ep. ad Philip. and again, Hom. 69. ad Populum. *It was not in vain Decreed by the Apoſtles, that in the celebration of thoſe moſt dreadful Myſteries, memory ſhould be made of thoſe who are Dead: They knew well that much benefit and profit did hence redound unto them.* See if you be ſafe who condemn that for Superſtitious, which the Apoſtles Decreed as moſt beneficial to the Souls; of which I have ſpoken more, *Sect.* 19. *n.* 4. And of St. *Auſtens* Authority, *Sect.* 12. *n.* 3, 4, 5. (and you muſt obſerve how he ſpeaks of that which

which on the one ſide he held wholly neceſſary, as Infants Baptiſm, not Re-Baptizing Hereticks, and yet now here ſet down in Scripture:) which is to come further Home then Dr. *Ferne* could wiſh. To theſe I add *Origen*, Prefat. in Lib. Periarch: *That only is to be Believed for* Truth, *which in nothing diſagrees from the* Tradition *of the* Church: *And in our underſtanding* Scripture, *we muſt not believe otherwiſe then the Church of God has by ſucceſſion delivered unto us.* Wherefore if all the World underſtood thoſe Words, *This is my Body*, concerning a moſt Real Corporal Preſence, we muſt not believe otherwiſe. Again becauſe, the publick practice of the Church does underſtand St. *Iames* (when he bids the Prieſts to be called for to anoint the Sick with Oyl to obtain forgiveneſs of their Sins) to ſpeak of a true Sacrament he clearly teaches by this Her practice, that the Scripture ſhould not be underſtood otherwiſe. The Authorities therefore of the Fathers, come home to our purpoſe, when ſo often they Inculcate this Verity.

5. So alſo do thoſe Fathers who profeſs themſelves to receive ſuch and ſuch Books for Canonical upon Tradition. The very ſame *Rufinus* (who alone is found to deliver the whole Canon juſt as you do,) in the Words immediatly going before the naming thoſe Canonical Books, ſpeaks thus, in *Enarratione Symboli: It ſeems good diſtinctly to ſet down in this place which be the Volums of the New and Old* Teſtament, *which are Believed to have been inſpired by the Holy Ghoſt.* (mark the ground why,) *according to the* Tradition *of our Anceſtors, as we have received them out of the Monuments of our Fore-fathers.* Note, that he here does not only take the Canonical Books for Tradition, which moſt *Proteſtants* will ſay they themſelves do, but he takes them *to be Canonical for* Tradition; and upon this Ground he ſaies, *They were Believed to have been inſpired by the Holy Ghoſt.* See alſo what I ſaid of the Council of *Carthage* and others, *Sect.* 3. Upon this Ground St. *Athanaſius* (in fine Synopſis) receives the Goſpel

of

of St. *Matthew*, and rejects the Goſpel of St. *Thomas*. Upon this ground *Tertullian*, St. *Hierome*, St. *Aug.* St. *Leo*, do admit ſuch Books to be, and to deny others to be Canonical. Upon this ground St. *Auſten* receives the Acts of the Apoſtles; See his Words, *Sect.* 22. *fine.* Hence alſo *Euſebius* ſaies in Hiſtor. Eccl. Lib. 3. *Such Scriptures by Tradition are held for true genuine and manifeſtly allowed by the Opinion of all, and that hence, as by an evident Note or Mark they be diſtinguiſhed from others.* Behold the moſt perſpicuous Note or Mark by which Scriptures could Infallibly be known. If this Rule be Fallible, we have no Infallibity of the Scriptures being or not being Canonical Writings. None of the Holy Fathers can be ſhewed to have let fall one Word inſinuating, that by the Light diſcovered in ſuch or ſuch Books, they were aſſured, and that Infallibly of their being Canonical; of which I ſpoke, *Sect.* 3.

SECTION XXI.

That the Fathers teach in general the Church *to be Infallible.*

1. BEſides thoſe manifold Authorities which I have cited out of the Fathers, clearly Teaching the Church Infallible in Her Traditions, (by which and by Her anſwerable practice, ſhe makes known to Her Children Her Belief,) and beſides thoſe other Authorities Teaching that this Church, in Her Repreſentative or General Councils, does with the Infallible aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, ſet forth Her Canons, or Rules for Belief and Practice; there be ſeveral other Authorities in which the Fathers in very full expreſſions, declare their Belief of the Churches Infallibility: For whenſoever the Fa-

thers

thers ſpeak of the Churches being to be followed by us in all things moſt ſecurely, as being a certain Guide or Rule; or when they uſe any ſuch kind of Speech they either mean the Church Repreſentative in a Lawful Council, or the Church Univerſal, delivering ſuch or ſuch a point by Tradition ſhining with conformable practice. Whence my *Reader* will obſerve how the Fathers (whoſe Speeches of the Church in general I am going to cite,) when they uſe ſuch general Speeches, do confirm, by their Authority, what I have ſaid of the Infallibility of the Church Repreſentative in Councils, or of the like Infallibility of the Church Univerſal in her Traditions. And on the otherſide all thoe manifold Authorities, by which Infallibility of Councils and Traditions have been already confirmed by me, do alſo confirm this General propoſition, *That the Church is Infallible*: That is, the Church as well Univerſal, ſpeaking by Tradition; as Repreſentative, ſpeaking by a General Council.

2. Of this Infallibility in general thus St. *Cyprian* de Unitate Eccl: *The Church is the ſpouſe of Chriſt which cannot play the Adultereſs.* And again Epiſt: 59. *the Church never departs from what ſhe once has known.* And St. *Hierome thus*, *Lib* 3. in Ruffinum, c. 8. fine. *In Her is the Rule or Square of Truth.* And thus alſo *Rufinus* (in *Enarrat: Symbol.*) Explicating thoſe Words; *I believe the Holy Catholick* Church *She therefore is the Holy* Church *not having ſpot or wrinkle*, Words ſpoken of *Chriſts* viſible Church on Earth as appears as well by the Words going before, which are; *In this* Church *there is one Faith one Baptiſm*; as by the Words following, *Many others have gathered Churches together as* Marcion, Valentinus, Arius, *&c. But thoſe* Churches *be not without ſpot and wrinkle.* Had CHRISTS only Church upon Earth been ſo foul, (as you muſt of neceſſity ſay it was for a full thouſand Years before your Reformation,) She had notoriouſly played the Adultereſs, and been indeed the Whore of *Babylon*, as you at every occaſion call the only

Church CHRIST then had, or as pure as any he then had. This Church also had interiorly departed from what She received, She had played the Mistress of Misrule and not been the Rule and Square of Truth; *lastly*, She had not been without most hideous spots, and far greater Deformities then wrinkles. See how you have Painted Her out above in my *Sect.* 15. *n* 5. How differently St. *Ireneus*, Lib. 3. C. 40. *where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God: But the Spirit is Truth:* And *Lactantius*, *Lib.* 3. *cap. ult.* calls the Church, *the Well-spring of Truth, the dwelling place of Faith.* You, who make the Church dwelling in Error, so many Ages joyn Error, and most intollerable Error, together with the Spirit of Truth. How was this Spirit of Truth in a Church imposing Lies (as you say) for Divine Verities; and exacting of all, under pain of Excommunication, to submit to Her proceedings herein? And yet you can find CHRIST no better Church for the last Thousand Years. There be four Fathers for whose Testimonies diverse of our Adversaries used to call, in so much that they account their deep silence our Condemnation, because those Fathers have Treated expresly against Hereticks, and undertaken how to direct others in the true Faith; and therefore doubtless, had they esteemed the Church to have been Infallible, they would have made Her Direction the first Rule all. The first of these Fathers is *Vincentius Lyrinensis*, whom I have already shewed at large to stand mainly upon this Direction: See his Words cited *Sect.* 7. As for the second, who is *Tertullian*, he lived before the Church had or could have any General Council, by Reason of the Universal Persecution under those Heathenish Emperors: And so *Tertullian* does not indeed speak of the Church Representative in Councils; Yet he speaks home of the Infallibility of the Church Universal, declaring Her Doctrine by Her Tradition, and Her practice conformable to Her Tradition, and in all thus declared, *Tertullian* holds Her Infallible; as I have already shewed the last *Sect. n* 47.

3. The

3. The third Father is St. *Epiphanius*, who how clearly he ſpeaks of the Infallibility of the Church in Her Traditions, we have ſeen in the ſame *Number:* I add here further an admirable ſaying of this Father of the Churches Infallibility: For having ſhewed, Hereſie 49. How all Hereſies ſeek to go by new found wayes, he calls the following of the Church, *that Kings high way of which* Moſes *ſpoke* (Myſtically by the King of *Edom*,) ſaying; *that he would paſs by that right on to the Land of Promiſe, neither declining at the right hand nor the left, neither on this ſide nor on that, but we will go on ſtraight in the Kings high way. For the Kings high way is the Holy Church of God, the Road of Truth. But every one of theſe* Hereſies *leaving this Kings high way, decline either on the right hand or on the left to Error. But you O Servants of God, you Sons of the Church of God, who have known the ſure Rule, and do go on in the way of* Truth, *go on clearfully, and be not called back by their Words and clamours, for their wayes be erronous*: So he. Here you have that all Hereſies agree in this, that they leave the Infallible Direction of the Church, and become Hereticks by chooſing out wayes on their own head, Erroneus wayes, which in the Church never could have been met withall, *ſhe being the Kings high way, the beaten Road of* Truth, *the ſure Rule, the way of* Truth. What more clear? To take the Churches Direction as Infallible, is the very Bane of Chriſtendom, with *Doctor Ferne;* with others it is the moſt intollerable Error in *Popery*, making all the Errors Incureable: And yet this Ancient Holy Father who (as St. *Auſten* in his Book of Hereſies ſaies) is the moſt Learned Man that had Written of Hereſies, reprehends all and every one of theſe Hereſies, for Erring, by refuſing to follow the Church, as *a ſure Rule*, and as *the Kings high-way*, and as *a known Road of* Truth. Now if your Cenſuring the Church for Teaching Her ſelf to be this ſure Rule and plain High-Way of Truth, were juſt, St. *Epiphanius* did himſelf Err moſt miſerably, in imputing the De-

nial of this to them all as an Error, of which every one of thoſe Hereſies ſtood Guilty. It is therefore moſt falſe which a certain *Univerſity Man* (of whom I ſhall ſpeak more in the next Sect.) over raſhly affirms, that neither St. *Epiphanius*, nor St. *Auſten* in their Catalogues of Hereticks, branded any one as Guilty for gainſaying this Infallible guidance of the Church. For you ſee St. *Epiphanius* brands all Hereſies with this foul Mark, ſaying; *That every one of theſe Hereſies leaving this Kings high-way* (of the Church the ſure Rule, and plain Road of Truth,) *declines either on the right hand, or on the left.* And the ſame Father ending his Books of Hereſies, ſaies, *theſe be the Young Wenches* (ſo he Reads that place of the *Canticles*, Cap. 6. *v.* 8.) *which are ſaid to be without number: And then* to the Church he applyes the next Verſe, *My Dove, my undefiled is but one, one is this Virgin, this chaſt one, this Spouſe, the* Holy *City of God, the Faith, the Foundation of Truth, the firm* Rock *againſt which the Gates of* Hell *ſhall not prevail.* And then going to give an Abridgment of the Faith of the Catholick Church, he exults in the begining, that he is now to have nothing to do with filthy Hereſies, but has made his approach *to the calm Coaſts of Truth*, to wit, the Doctrine of the Church. And mark how ſecure from Errors he thinks himſelf here; *for now* (ſaies he) *being free of all fear and trouble and tediouſneſs, and being in an excellent poſture by* Reaſon *of the firm tranquility and ſecurity here breathing, how did we rejoyce in Spirit being received in a Serene Heaven? We have paſſed many Evils in our Navigation, through the foreſaid Sea*, (of Hereſie;) *but now having in ſight the City* (of the Church) *let us make haſte to this Holy* Jeruſalem, *and Virgin of* Chriſt, *and Spouſe, and ſecure Foundation and Rock, our* Reverend *Mother, moſt ſeaſonably ſaying; Let us aſcend unto the Mountain of our Lord, and into the Houſe of the God of* Jacob, *and She will teach us our wayes*, (and not Errors, for how free She is from them he further expreſſes.)

Le

Let us ſpeak to Her *theſe Words which* Her *Spouſe did; Come my Spouſe from* Libanus, *becauſe thou art all Fair, and there is not any ſpot in thee:* (This he ſaies of the Viſible Church on Earth, Teaching us on Earth *Her wayes*, for preſently he flyes to Her thus;) *to the end that being placed in thee, we may reſt from thoſe troubleſome buſineſſes of the foregoing* Hereſies, *in thee our Holy Mother the* Church, *and in thy Holy Doctrine, and that we may be refreſhed in the Truth with the Holy and only Faith of God.* And having ſpoken ſo full of this perfect ſecurity from Error in the Church; he tells us whence it proceeds; to wit, from the ſpecial aſſiſtance of God, and that She is not like thy Concubin-Queens, but that She is Queen, as the true Spouſe, *having for her dowry from* Chriſt *the receiving of the Holy Ghoſt.* And then having ſpent good part of this *Abridgment* in ſhewing, by the groſs Errors among Gentiles and Hereticks, that their Faith was like the Concubines, which have no ſuch Dowry from *Chriſt*, he returns to declare in diverſe particular points the Faith of this Chaſte Virgin the Church, in which nevertheleſs he ſpends but a Leaf and a half according to my Book. This I note, becauſe Dr. *Ferne Sect.* 30. wonders that in a Book of this Subject there ſhould be no more mention of *Popiſh* Doctrines, had they been the Doctrines of Antiquity. I think this Doctor never ſo much as Read that Book, for if he had, he ſhould have found that he ſpeaks of no one point of any true Chriſtian Faith at all, untill he comes to theſe three laſt Leaves, except it be of the admirable Praiſes of the Church and of Her Infallibility, or moſt ſafe, certain, and ſecure Direction: Which is the prime point of *Popiſh* Doctrine. But whoſoever ſhall come to Anſwer that place of Dr. *Ferne*, will tell him how many other Popiſh points make up the other Leaf, and the Leaf following: All which points are put down by St. *Epiphanius* as Traditions neceſſary to be delivered here by him.

4. St. *Epiphanius* was moſt wrongfully accuſed by that Univerſity Man of ſilence, concerning this point of Infallibility (which

(which he ſo much extolles , whereas he ſhould have put it for one of the Hereſies if he had been one of your Religion :) So alſo is St. *Auſten* no leſs wronged , who is the fourth Father who ſilence of this Infallibility they object ; and firſt ſay they , he calles no Man Heretick for denying of it , whereas all Hereticks mentioned by him in his Books of Hereſie , could not but deny it according to us , or elſe they had not been Hereticks. A ſtrange Argument you ſay , becauſe , all Hereticks denyed this ; therefore he ſhould have at leaſt noted this in ſome one of them. I contrariwiſe ſay , becauſe every one of theſe Hereticks denied this therefore it had been ridiculous to expreſs it concerning any one of them as if he had been ſingular in that one which is common to all , and every one, (for example were it not ridiculous in the Catalogue of Canonical Books , put down , in the front of the Bible, to ſay of ſome particular Books , for example , of the Book *Leviticus* or the Book of *Judges*) *this Book is the true Word of God.* And would not ſuch an addition , make Men think , that the being the true Word of God , was leſs common to other Books , or that there were ſome ſpecial doubt of theſe two Books. Juſt ſo it would be ridiculous to ſay ſuch Hereticks, held the Church Fallible, a thing common to all Hereticks. Therefore you ſee St *Epiphanius*, when he was ſpeaking of any particular Hereſie, did not ſay, what he ſaid of that particular Hereſie , but he ſaid, *every one of theſe Hereſies do this;* there never being any ſpecial doubt concerning any one ſingle Hereſie , whether it did do that or no , which all Hereſies , muſt needs do ; in ſo much that to give you a Catalogue of Hereticks , is the ſelf ſame thing that it is to give up a Liſt of ſuch Men , who , teaching a Doctrine , differing from the Church to be true ; muſt needs teach her Doctrine to be falſe : And conſequently that ſhe did Err , and is Fallible ; and therefore a Judge not to be ſubmitted unto in thoſe Her Errors. Neither did St. *Auſten* omit to note this , if you omit not to note well what he ſaies. Firſt in the begining , he puts down the Epiſtle of *Quod vult*

Deus

Deus, intreating him to Writ this Book *that he might know what Hereſies there have been? What they did hold contrary to the* Catholick Church? *And alſo what on the contrary the* Catholick Church *has declared againſt them*? Theſe two Queſtions St. *Auſten* takes ſpecial notice of in his Preface to his Book, repeating them in the Words in which they were propoſed by *Quod vult Deus:* And then he begins to ſatisfie his firſt Queſtion; by telling him what every Hereſie has held contrary to the Catholick Church. Do you not here ſee how, on all ſides, it is ſuppoſed that every Hereſie held ſome thing to be true, which the Church held to be falſe, and that therefore every Hereſie muſt needs Teach that the Church is Guilty of Errors, and being Miſtreſs of Errors cannot be Infallible in deciding all points truly. A little skill *in Æquipollentibus* (to which thoſe arrive who have paſſed the Bridge,) would have made an Univerſity Man ſee a thing ſo clear. Eſpecially being the ſecond Queſtion makes the firſt yet more clear, by acknowledging that it is the part of the Church to declare Her meaning againſt Hereticks, which is to acknowledge Her the Judge in theſe matters. For this Queſtion was to know *quid contra teneat Eccleſia quantum inſtructioni ſatis eſt ſubdi, that as much as was neceſſary for inſtruction might be told him concerning the contrary Judgment of the* Church. St. *Auſten* comes not to touch in the leaſt Word this ſecond Demand, untill the end of his Book, and then he cuts him of thus; *It is ſuperfluouſly Demanded* (what you expected to be told by me,) *what the* Catholick Church *Judges againſt all theſe, ſeeing that for this end* (of having as much Inſtruction as it is neceſſary,) *it is ſufficient to know that the* Catholick Church *is of a contrary Judgment to all theſe. Therefore every* Chriſtian Catholick *ought not to believe theſe things.* Behold here the Judgment of the Church ſo much eſteemed, that we *have as much as is ſufficient for our Inſtruction* to avoid any Opinion, when we do but know *that the* Church *Judges the contrary:* And to deſire *to know*

more,

more, is ſuperfluous; for this alone is enough to make any Chriſtian Catholick not to be of a Judgment contrary to the Judgment of the Church. Could any Pope in thoſe our daies have ſpoken more Papiſtically? If you were to make a Catalogue of groſs Errors, and Errors Incureable? you would put this down in Capital Letters.

5. Let this then be *the firſt Authority* of St. *Auſten* for the Infallibility of the Church; that we have enough to disbelieve any Opinion, when ſhe bids us disbelieve it: Whence it evidently follows, that we have ſufficient to believe any thing, becauſe ſhe bids us believe it; her Authority being as well aſſured for the one, as for the other. *A Second* very full place I gave you *Sect.* 19. *n.* 7. *Thirdly*, it is notorious that St. *Auſten* often profeſſes (ſee his Words which I cite preſently,) that Baptiſm given by Hereticks is to be held of Infallible validity: And this, not becauſe it is ſet down in any Scripture (for he confeſſes it is clearly ſet down in no Scripture;) but becauſe the Church in a Plenary Council has declared it to be ſo; as he often urges in the begining of *his fourth Book de Baptiſmo* and there, *Chap.* 4. he holds the validity of the Baptiſm given by Hereticks to be a point *revealed by the Holy Ghoſt;* to wit, when the Apoſtles delivered this Tradition firſt to the Church; as he intimats there *Chap.* 6. This Revelation, made by the Holy Ghoſt of this point, did then grow to oblige all to aſſent unto it, when it was notified to the Church by a Plenary Council after St. *Cyprians* dayes; as the ſame Saint alſo teaches. *Fourthly*, he accounts it alſo *to have proceeded from the Holy Ghoſt*, that we are oblidged to Communicate before we Eat any thing: Which Will of the Holy Ghoſt is not notified to us by any Scripture: But the Church is of ſufficient Authority to notifie this Will of the Holy Ghoſt, and to make it Obligatory. His Words are; *It is manifeſt that when the Diſciples received the Body and Blood of our Lord, they did not receive faſting: Muſt we therefore calumniate the Univerſal* Church *for alwayes receiv-*

ceiving Faſting? *For hence it is that it has pleaſed the Holy Ghoſt, that in the Honour of ſo great a Sacrament, the Body of our Lord ſhould enter into the Mouth of a Chriſtian before External Meats. For this cauſe this cuſtome is kept through the whole World.* Epiſt. 118. ad Januarium. Fifthly, St. *Auſten*, Lib. 7. de Baptiſmo C. 53. Treating of a Queſtion in which nothing was yet defined by the Church, ſaies: *It is not ſafe for us raſhly to deliver our Opinion in this matter, which is not determined by any Council; but let our care be* (ſaies he) *to affirm that to be* (ſecuræ vocis,) *a thing to be ſpoken ſecurely which in the Government of our Lord and Saviour* Jeſus Chriſt *is confirmed by the Confeſſion of the Univerſal* Church. No danger of Error in this Speech; For I ask you, were you not (without fear of being led into Error,) ſecurely to rely upon the Teſtimony of that party whom *Chriſt* ſhould bid you Believe? You dare not but ſay Yes. Read then *Sixthly* St. *Auſten*, and mark how fully he tells you, that what the Church tells you, is told by one, upon whoſe Teſtimony *Chriſt* did bid you rely: And mark how he infers from hence that; as not to hear ſuch a Perſon, whom *Chriſt* did bid you hear in ſuch a Controverſie, were rather to reject *Chriſt*, then to reject ſuch a Perſon: So not to hear the Church, whom he did bid you hear in all Controverſies, is not ſo much to reject Her, as to reject *Chriſt*. See if he ſpeaks not to this effect as fully as I have done. Thus then he Writes, *de* Unitate Fidei, c. 19. *Let now an* Heretick *ſay unto me, how do you admit of me into your Communion?* (He ſpeaks of ſuch an one as was Baptized by Hereticks;) then he replyes: *I readily anſwer you. I admit of you as that* Church *admits of you, to which* Church *our Saviour gives Teſtimony. Do you know better, how you ought to be admited of, then our* Saviour? *Here perhaps you will ſay, read unto me then* (out of Scripture) *in what manner* Chriſt *has commanded thoſe to be admitted of, who deſire to paſs from* Hereticks *to the* Church? *This clearly and manifeſtly* (ſet

down in Scripture) *neither I do read nor you. Now then, ſeeing that in* Scripture *we find not that any who paſſed from the* Hereticks *to the* Church, *were admitted of, either as* I *ſay*, (without being Re-Baptized) *or as you ſay;* (by firſt Re-Baptizing of them:) *I am of Opinion, that if there ſhould have been ſome Wiſe Man, to whom our Lord* Jeſus Chriſt *gives Teſtimony, and this* (Wiſe) *Man were conſulted by us, we ought by no means to doubt of doing that, which he ſhould ſay, leaſt that we ſhould be Judged, not ſo much to be refractory to this* (Wiſe) *Man as to be refractory to* Chriſt *our Lord*, by *whoſe Teſtimony he was commended* (to be heard.) *But* Chriſt *does give Teſtimony to his* Church. *If then thou wilt not* (be admitted of, as She admits of thee,) *thou doeſt moſt perniciouſly reſiſt not me, or any Man, who will thus admit of thee;* but thou *doeſt moſt perniciouſly reſiſt our* Saviour *himſelf*, contrary to thy *Salvation* (that is damnably,) *being that thou wilt not Believe* that thou *oughteſt to be admitted of in ſuch a manner, as* that Church *does admit of thee, which* Church *he*, by *his Teſtimony, does commend, he*, (I ſay) *whom* you your *ſelf confeſs that it is a wicked thing not to Believe.* So he: And no *Papiſt* could ſpeak more cleatly, to declare the Damnable Sin of being refractory to the Church, even when She has no other Scripture for what She bids, then that Scripture which *bids us hear and Obey Her.* To which purpoſe *Seventhly*, Lib. 6. 1. Contra Creſcon. *cap.* 33. ſpeaking of the very ſelf ſame point, in which the Churches Infallible Authority without other Scripture, is to be wholly relyed upon, to wit, *That Baptiſm given by* Hereticks *is true Baptiſm. Therefore altho' truly concerning this thing no example can be brought out of the Canonical* Scriptures, *yet even in this very thing the Truth of the ſame* Scriptures *is held by us, when we do that which has pleaſed the* Church: *Which* Church *the Authority of the ſame* Scriptures *does commend*, that *becauſe the* Holy Scripture *cannot deceive, whoſoever fears to be deceived by the obſcurity of this*

Queſti-

Queſtion, let him go and conſult the Church *concerning the ſame* (obſcure Queſtion) *which* Church *the* Holy Scripture *without all doubtfulneſs does demonſtrate to us.* Behold here St. *Auſten*, in a neceſſary point of Faith (which after the Scriptures peruſed is ſtill obſcure) frees us from all fear of Erring; if, even in ſuch a point, we rely on the Church as Infallible. Hence *Eightly*, on the *Pſal.* 57. he Writes thus: *It may be that a Man may Lie, but it cannot be that Truth can Lie. From the Mouth of Truth I acknowledged* Chriſt *Truth it ſelf. From the Mouth of Truth I acknowledged the* Church *partaker of Truth.* Behold that to a Man ſubject to Lie, he oppoſes Firſt, *Chriſt Truth it ſelf by Eſſence;* Secondly, he oppoſes the Church *Truth by Participation of his Truth;* both of them Infallible, or *not ſubject to Lie, as Man is. Ninthly*, having delivered the Doctrine of the Church concerning Baptizing Children (which point as I ſhewed *Sect.* 8. *n.* 5. he held not be clearly ſet down in Scripture,) he accounts himſelf by the Churches Authority alone ſo Infallibly grounded in this point, that he breaks forth into theſe Words, *Serm.* 14. de verbis Apoſtol. cap. 18. *The Authority of our Mother the* Church *has this. This is made good by the grounded Rule of Truth. Againſt this Strength, againſt this inſuperable Wall whoſoever ruſhes ſhall be cruſhed.* A place ſo convincing, that thoſe great Defenders of your cauſe in the Famous Conference of *Ratisbon*, were forced to anſwer to it thus; *In this point we freely diſſent from* Auſten. In Protocal. Monach. edit. 2. Pag. 367. But let them take what the ſame St. *Auſten Tenthly* ſaies; Ep. ad Januar. 118. cap. 5. *If the whole* Church *through the whole World practice any thing, it is moſt inſolent Madneſs to Diſpute whether that ought to be practiſed or no.* So he. Now this by no means could be true without the Church were Infallible. For a Wiſe Man may with modeſty Diſpute againſt that, which may well be an Error. *Eleventhly*, becauſe the Enemies of the Infallibility of the Church, uſe to fright the Defenders thereof with

a fond fear of being miſled blindly by Her Prelates, who may (ſay they even in Council Err; St. *Auſtin* anſwers for us thus, Epiſt. 166. fine. *In ſo much as he makes his People ſecure from ill Governours, leaſt for them the Chair of wholeſome Doctrine ſhould be forſaken, in which even the Evil are conſtrained to deliver true things. For they are not their own things which they ſay; but Gods, who has placed the Doctrine of Verity in the Chair of Unity*, whence he ſaies, *Do what they ſay, but according to their Works do you not*, *Mat.* 23. So he.

6. *Twelfthly*, this Prince of Doctors, has a place which I will ponder apart, not only becauſe he ſaies clearly as much as we could wiſh, but chiefly becauſe he proves unanſwerably what he ſaies. And therefore this Authority is not anſwered without anſwering the Arguments which he preſſeſs like a Maſter Diſputant, demonſtrating clearly why at the very writing of this, he refuſed to be a *Manichæan*, and why every one, both Infidels and Chriſtians, ought to refuſe the ſame. I will put his Golden Diſcourſe at large, adding a ſhort Paraphraſis, to put my Reader in mind of ſuch reflections as deſerve to be made of ſo admirable Words. This place is, *lib. contra Epiſt. Fundamenti cap.* 4. The *Epiſtle of* Manicheus (which the Manicheans would have paſs for Goſpel) *begines thus. Manichæus the Apoſtle of* Jeſus Chriſt *by the providence of God the Father. I ask therefore* (ſaies *St. Auguſten:*) *who this Manicheus is? You will anſwer the Apoſtle of Chriſt: I do not believe it. Perhaps you will read the Goſpel unto me endeavouring thence to prove it. And what if you did light upon one who did not believe the Goſpel? What would you do then, if ſuch an one ſhould ſay unto you*, I *do not believe you.* (This is his Argument, to prove why an Infidel has no Reaſon to be a *Manichean*, becauſe you *Manicheans* (your *Lutherans* and *Calvinists*,) who deny the Authority of the Church, by taking away Her Infallibility, leave no Infallible Authority upon which any Man

Man can ſafely rely in admitting the Goſpel for the undoubted Word of God. Wherefore St. *Auſten* tells them, that they deſtroying this Ground, leave him no Infallible ground to believe the Goſpel more then Infidels do believe it. Wherefore he adds; *But I would not* (becauſe now you have left me no ſufficient, that is, no Infallible ground for it;) *But I would not believe the Goſpel unleſs the Authority of the* Church *did move me thereunto.* Here is the firſt place, where he tells you the Church is eſteemed by him ſo ſure a Ground, (which it could not be were it a fallible Ground,) that upon it alone he Builds the Belief of this Article; *The* Scripture *is the Word of God:* I ſay, he Builds the Belief of this upon this Ground alone, becauſe he tells us, if it were not for this Ground, he would not believe this Fundamental point, whence appears the weakneſs of our Adverſaries beſt anſwer; which as St. *Auſten* only tells us here, what occaſionally moved him, when he was a *Manichean*, firſt, to believe the Goſpel; ſo that the ſenſe (ſay they) is this; I, when I was a *Manichean*, would not have believed the Goſpel, had it not been that the Churches Authority had firſt occaſionally moved me thereunto. But I pray reflect how clear it is by S. *Auſtens* Words that he gives an abſolute Univerſal Reaſon, why, at the very Writing of this Diſcourſe, he received the Goſpel for Gods true Word, ſo moved thereunto by the Authority of the Church that were it not for Her Authority, he would not believe the Goſpel to be the Word of God. If he ſhould only have told the *Manicheans*, what he had done at his firſt Converſion occaſionally upon a ground; which ground now he himſelf thought unſufficient for ſuch an Infallible aſſent; he had given them no kind of ſatisfaction; neither could he have urged them ſtill (as he does,) that he, in rejecting *Manicheans* muſt needs rely (as upon ſure ground) on the ſame Authority, upon which he firſt relying was moſt groundedly induced to give credit to the Scripture. The Truth then is, that St. *Auſten* told them; that neither Infidels could believe them, (they only citeing Goſpel;) nor Catholicks could

could believe them, becauſe they only cited that Goſpel againſt the Church; which he himſelf with all Catholicks believed only to be true Goſpel for the Authority of the Church. Whence it follows in him; *Why ſhould not* I (now at the Writing of theſe) *Obey them* (the Prelates of the Church,) *ſaying unto me, Do not Obey* Manicheus *to whom* I *obeyed*, ſaying *believe the Goſpel.* (Note here that he tells you he had ſo good a Ground for what he did, that even now this motive, as an invincible motive, prevails with him:) For he ſtill makes it good thus; " *Chooſe which you pleaſe.* If you ſay, believe the Catholicks; " they admoniſh me to give no Credit to you. Wherefore be- " lieving them I cannot but disbelieve you. But if you ſay " do not believe the Catholicks; then you do not take a right " courſe to force me, by the Goſpel, to believe *Manicheus;* " (I pray mark his Reaſon:) Becauſe I believed the Goſpel " it ſelf, the Catholicks Preaching it unto me. But if you " ſay, (to me) you have rightly believed the Catholicks " Praiſing the Goſpel, but you have not rightly believed them " diſpraiſing *Manicheus;* do you think me ſo very a Fool, " that no Reaſon being rendered for it, I will believe what " you liſt, and disbelieve what you liſt; except you do not " only bid me believe what you will, but you alſo, moſt " manifeſtly and evidently, make me know it. *If* you *be* (as you will ſay,) *going to give me ſuch a* Reaſon as ſhall make it manifeſtly and evidently known to me that the Catholicks Erred, in the biding me not believe *Manicheus*, but that they Erred not in the biding me receive the Goſpel, what then? *Dimitte Evangelium. Bid farewell to the Goſpel.* (why?) *Becauſe if* you *hold* your *ſelf to the Goſpel* (upon a ground that cannot deceive you) I (for my part) *will hold my ſelf to thoſe, through whoſe Teaching* I *have believed the Goſpel, and at their command* I *will not believe thee.* Behold St. *Auſten* tells them, that even now he will not believe them, becauſe even now he believes the Goſpel *at their Teaching by whoſe command he is not to believe you.* I pray what had this anſwer been to the purpoſe, if St.

Au-

Auſten had thought the Catholicks now to be believed with aſſent leſs then Infallible? For if he had thought they could have miſled him in bidding him *believe the Goſpel*, he might have thought they could alſo miſled him in bidding him *not believe* Manicheus. But you will ſay he thought they might bring manifeſt and evident Demonſtrations for this laſt, becauſe he inſinuates that if they did ſo, he would believe them, even when they ſaid *he had Reaſon to believe the* Church praiſing the Goſpel, but not to believe it, *diſpraiſing* Manicheus. Whereas from that which we hold Infallible, no Reaſon ſhall remove us. I anſwer, that he who ſaies to a Man of another Religion, I do not mean to paſs to your Religion except you can ſhew me, by manifeſt and evident Demonſtration that my Religion is falſe; does he, by this ſaying intimate that he does not give Infallible aſſent to the Religion he is now of? For one may ſay to an Athieſt. *I will Die for my belief in the Scripture, except you evidently can Demonſtrate that the Scripture is falſe, and cannot be Gods Word.* In theſe ſpeeches a mans meaning is, that untill you can ſhew me that you have done this (which I am ſure you cannot ſhew me) you have no Reaſon to find fault with me for not paſſing over unto you. I prove this to be ſo here if I may but ſuppoſe (a thing moſt true) that St. *Auſten* did, with an Infallible aſſent believe the Goſpel. For I pray obſerve if he ſpeaks not of his intending to forſake his belief in the very Goſpel it ſelf, if the *Manicheans* can ſhew by Scripture that any Doctrine contrary to the belief of the Church can be true. So impoſſible did he hould it to ſhew the Church Fallible in any one point. For even thus he ſaies; *If perhaps in the Goſpel thou ſhalt be able to find any place that is manifeſt to prove* Manicheus *a true Apoſtle, then indeed you ſhall weaken unto me the Authority of the Catholicks biding me not believe thee* (by ſhewing their Aurhority is Fallible.) Be pleaſed to reflect attentively on what follows; *This Authority* (of the Catholicks) *being weakned, now I cannot ſo much as believe the Goſpel.*

The

The Word *(now,)* ſhews that at the very Writing of this, he profeſſes that if the Catholicks Authority could, but in any one ſingle point, be ſhewed Fallible, *he cannot now believe the Goſpel;* becauſe ſaies he, *by thoſe Catholicks*, I *had believed the Goſpel*, whom you now have in one point ſhewed Fallible. Here ſome of our Adverſaries catch hold one thoſe Words, *becauſe by thoſe Catholicks*, I *had believed;* whereas, ſay they, If he had meant their Authority had been the cauſe of his Belief, he ſhould not have uſed the Particles, *Per*, *by*, or *through*, but the Particle *Propter*, for. A weak Objection; for how often in Scripture does this Particle, *By*, expreſs the true Cauſe upon which, and only which Men believed Infallibly, as all did firſt *by*, or *through*, the Preaching of *Chriſt*. So Jo. 17. *v.* 20. *Chriſt* Prayes, not only for his Apoſtles, but alſo *for them which ſhould Believe in him*, by *or* through, *their Words*. And St. *Paul*, 2 Theſ. 2. *v.* 15. would have us *ſtand and hold the Traditions which have been Taught us by Word, or by his Epiſtle*. What was held by thoſe Authorities was held by them with Infallibility. *That by two immutable things in which it was impoſſible for God to Lie, we might have ſtrong conſolation*, Hebr. 6. 18. Weaker then this is another cavel that; St. *Auſten* could not eſteem the Church Infallible, becauſe for a clear place in Scripture he would have denyed Her Infallibility: For according to this fond cavelling Reaſon he ſhould have alſo eſteemed the Scripture Fallible, becauſe he likewaies ſaies; *the Catholicks Authority being weakened, now* I *cannot ſo much as believe the Goſpel*. The Truth then is that he ſpeaks with an Heretick, denying the Churches Infallibility, and Diſputing againſt it out of Scripture; Wherefore he ſpeaks juſt with him, as we uſe to ſpeak with you, doing the like; that is, he tells him only what ſhould happen if his Impoſſibilities were ſhewed to be Realities. And firſt he ſaies, that unleſs his open Falſities can be Demonſtrated out of the true Word of God, (which is one impoſſibility,) he would not believe. *Secondly*, he,

even

even after the performance of this impoſſibility tells him, he has yet another anſwer, to wit, that he will neither believe him ſpeaking that, which he could ſhew to be clear Goſpel, neither would he believe the Church any more, becauſe She had Taught him to believe that to be Gods true Word, which notwithſtanding did bear clear Witneſs to that which She Taught to be a Lie: Whence he, ſeeing Her in one point Fallible, would never rely on Her ſo as to believe the Scripture upon Her Authority, as then he did. You ſhall ſee how clearly he ſaies this; *Wherefore* (ſaies he) *if in the Goſpel no manifeſt place be found concerning the Apoſtleſhip of* Manicheus, *I will rather believe the* Catholicks *then thee: But if thou ſhalt read me out of the Goſpel any place manifeſtly for* Manicheus, *I will neither believe them, nor thee. I will not believe them, becauſe they have Lied unto me concerning thee*, (this one Lie ſhewing their Church to be Fallible;) *Neither will I believe thee*, (even citing clear Scripture, as thou call-eſt it,) *becauſe thou citeſt to me that Scripture to which I gave credit be thoſe who have Lied unto me.* Which Words be perfect non-ſenſe, without you ſay the Scripture in St. *Auſtens* Opinion looſes (in order to us) Her Infallibility, if the Catholick Church can tell one Lie: For in that caſe St. *Auſten* ſaies, he would forſake both Church and Scripture alſo, if any clear place in Scripture ſhould ſay Manicheus *was a true Apoſtle.* And he ſaies that for that caſe, and upon that ground he would forſake Scripture, becauſe it was that Scripture, which he only held to be ſo, by the Authority of the Catholick Church, which now he had taken in one Lie. But for all this, ſaies he, *God forbid I ſhould not believe the Goſpel*, for thou canſt not bring any thing to make me believe either the Church, or that which is commended for Gods Word by the Church to be contrary to Truth. *For even believing the Goſpel*, I *do no find how* I *can believe thee*, there being in the Goſpel nothing for thee. And then he ſhews, how clearly he finds the Acts of the Apoſtles to be againſt them: *Which*

Book (saies he) *it is necessary for me to believe if I do believe the Gospel.* Note *first*, how he speaks of the Belief he had now at the very Writing of these, saying, that he must believe this Book, which is a Book rejected by the *Manicheans*. Whence it is manifest, that he speaks of himself, as now a Catholick and such a Catholick as received only such Books for Gods true Word, as the Church recommended to him for such; holding also Her recommendation so sure, that She could not fail in recommending any one Book for Gods Word, which was not of necessity to be held so, meerly upon Her recommendation; For thus he proves that it was then necessary for him to believe this Book, (of the Acts of the Apostles which the *Manicheans* held to be no Scripture,) if he believes the Gospel, *Because the* Catholick *Authority* (of the Church) *does in like manner commend both* Scriptures *unto me*, to wit, as well the Acts, as the four Gospels; for indeed it is proper to those who believe the Church Fallible, to believe Her only when they think fitting: Whereas those who with St. *Austen* believe Her Infallible, must needs speak as he does, that being the Church proposes this to be believed, as well as that, it is necessary for me to believe this on Her Authority, as well as that.

SECT.

SECTION XXII.

That all which the Fathers ſay of the Infallibility of the Church *in Her Traditions or Councils, or in general Terms, is meant by them particularly of the* Roman Church, *as we underſtand the* Roman Church.

1. I Muſt now take away from our Adverſaries their laſt ſhift, which is that altho' St. *Auſten* and ſo many other Fathers ſpeak ſo often of the Infallibility of the Traditions of the Church, and of the Councils, of the Church, and of the Churches Authority in general; yet, ſay they, what is this to the *Roman* Church, more then to the *Engliſh* which is a part of the Catholick as well as the *Roman*; ſhe only being a part and not the whole Catholick Church? I anſwer, that when we ſay the Church is Infallible, we ſpeak, as Antiquity uſes to ſpeak of the Church: That is, we ſpeak of it, as of a Flock adhearing to their true Head-Paſtor; and conſequently we ſpeak of the Church of *Rome* in this ſenſe, as She is a Church Catholick, that is, Univerſally comprehending all the Sheep of *Chriſt*, living in any Nation tho' never ſo far from *Rome*, yet joined in Communion to the Biſhop of *Rome*, as to Her Head-Paſtor: For thus the Roman Church as comprehending all Churches United to Her Communion; cannot be ſhewed in any time ſince *Chriſt*, to have differed in Doctrine from what the Univerſal Church, ever Taught, or practiſed: If therefore the Univerſal Church, following Tradition be, by the guidance of the ſame Tradition Infallibly conducted, according to the Opinion of the Fathers; the *Roman* Church, ever, treading the very ſelf ſame ſtepps,

muſt needs have proceeded as Infallibly. Again, if the Church Repreſentative be Infallibly guided by the Holy Ghoſt, as I have proved, the ſelf ſame muſt needs be true of the *Roman* Church, who ever was joyned in Communion and Unity of Doctrine with every lawful General Council which has been from *Chriſts* time to this. For it is ſo notorious, that our Adverſaries cannot deny it, that the Biſhop of *Rome* either by himſelf, or by his Legates in his name, has preſided in every ſuch Council, and ſubſcribed unto it in the very firſt and chief place; or at leaſt he did ſend his confirmation and ratification of all the Acts thereof. Her Doctrine has then alwaies agreed with all Lawful Councils: If their Decrees be Infallible Rules, as I have proved, then the *Roman* Churches Doctrine, ever Ruled by them, is Infallible. And the ſame Fathers who ſay the Doctrine agreeing with Councils is Infallible, alſo by manifeſt conſequence ſay, that the Doctrine of the *Roman* Church is Infallible. This being ſo notorious, no wonder if the Fathers many times promiſcuouſly ſpeak in the ſame manner of the *Roman* Church, and of the Church in General, and take the one for the other, making no diſtinction at all. And this they do both for the Reaſons before ſaid, as alſo becauſe by the very name of the Church they underſtood the flock of *Chriſt* governed by St. *Peter*, and his Succeſſors as their Lawful Paſtor appointed by *Chriſt*. And, juſt as the Apoſtle tells us, *that* Chriſt *did purchaſe a Church unto himſelf by his Blood*; So St. Chryſoſtom. Lib. 2. de Sacerd. Asking, *why* Chriſt *did ſhed his Blood*? Anſwers, *That he might purchaſe unto himſelf his Sheep, the charge of which he committed both to* Peter *and his Succeſſors*. Hence you ſee that with him the Church Univerſal, is one, and the ſelf ſame thing, that the Flock of *Chriſts* Sheep, governed by St. *Peters* Succeſſors the Biſhop of *Rome*. So St. Cyprian tells us *Epiſtle*. 69. *That the* Church *is a People united to their Prieſt, and a flock adhearing to their Sheephard*. Hence Venerable Bede Lib. 2. Hiſt. Eccl. cap. 2. ſaies Pope *Greg. Gover-*

verned the Church *in the dayes of* Mauritius *the Emperour.* And St. Gregory Lib. 4 Dial. c. 40. ſaies *the* Church, *refuſed* Laurance *to be Her Governour* when *Symmachus* was choſen Pope. He uſed the ſtyle of St. *Irenæus* Lib. 3. cap. 3. who ſaies *that to* Linus (the Succeſſor of St. *Peter*) *the Apoſtles gave the charge of Governing the* Church; taking the *Roman* Biſhops charge promiſcuouſly for the charge of the Univerſal Church: And St *Hierome* Epiſt. 58, ad Damaſum. *If any one be joined to the Chair of St.* Peter, Meus eſt, *he is of my Religion.* And Again *Ep.* 57. To the ſame Pope he ſpeaks thus; *To thy Holyneſs*, that is, *to the Chair of* St. Peter I *am joined in Communion; upon this* Rock (ſo he calls St. *Peters* Chair) I *know the* Church *is Built. He is profane, whoſoever he is, who Eats the Lamb out of this Houſe. He who is not in the Ark of* Noah *ſhall periſh in the Deluge.* And St. Leo *Ep.* 84. *ad Anaſt. c.* 11. ſhews diſtinctly, how in the Church there is ſuch ſubordination of the People to their Biſhops, and of theſe their higher Biſhops; And of all higher Biſhops to the Biſhop of *Rome*; *that by them the charge of the Univerſal* Church *might be referred to that one* Chair of Peter, *ſo nothing any where ſhould diſagree from their Head.* St. *Hierome*, again, 1 ad Tim. 3. ſaies, that *Pope* Damaſus *was Rector of that Houſe of God which* St. Paul *called the Pillar and Foundation of Truth.* And St. *Ambroſe* in Oratione *funeb. de obitu fratris ſui Satyri*, praiſes his Brother *Satyrus* for his care in chooſing a Catholick Biſhop by this Rule, *that he inquired whether they agreed with the* Catholick *Biſhops*, that is, *with the* Roman Church: So he, taking the Catholick and the Roman for all one. Hence St. *Cyprian* calls the Biſhop of *Rome*, the Biſhop of the Catholick Church. *We know* Cornelius *to have been Elected by Almighty* God *and* Chriſt *our Lord, the Biſhops of the moſt Holy* Catholick Church: *Neither are we ignorant that there ought to be one God, one* Chriſt *our Lord, one Holy Ghoſt, one Biſhop in the* Catholick Church. So he *Lib.* 3. *Ep.* 11. And

again,

again, *de Unitate Eccleſiæ: Does he confide himſelf to be in the* Church, *who forſakes the* Chair *of* Peter; *upon which the* Church *is founded?* Whence it is evident that by the Church he meant the multitude of Believers adhearing to the Chair of the Biſhop of *Rome*. So alſo the moſt Ancient Pope *Anacletus*, not four-ſcore Years after our Saviours Death, ſpoke thus, in the end of his firſt Epiſtle Regiſtred among the Decretals and Councils; *The Apoſtles by the command of our* Saviour *have appointed that the greater and harder Queſtions ſhould always be referred to the Apoſtolical Seat, upon which* Chriſt *has Built the Univerſal* Church, *he himſelf ſaying, Thou art Peter* (that is a Rock,) *and upon this Rock I will Build my* Church. So he. Hence I have the very Ground why the Fathers promiſcuouſly by the Name of the Church, Univerſally underſtood the *Roman* Church, upon whoſe Seat the Univerſal was Built. And this Ground is made good by a World of Fathers *in Coccius*, where he Treates of the Primacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*.

2. That which is for my preſent intent, is to ſhew that the Fathers, and why the Fathers do take the Name of *the Church* promiſcuouſly for the *Roman Church*, tho' they do not Name Her by that Name; becauſe it was ſo notorious, that by the Name of the Church they meant no other thing then *Chriſts* Flock under their true Sheephard the Biſhop of *Rome*: And when it is once notoriouſly known to the Hearers what is meant by ſuch a Word, the uſe of it is ſufficiently determinate. So here in *England*, when with one another we ſay the Parliament did Decree or Examine ſuch a thing, we are known notoriouſly to ſpeak of the *Engliſh* Parliament; tho' the Word *Parliament* be as indifferent to ſignifie the *French* Parliament, eſpecially, if ſpoken by *French* to *French* in the middle of *France*; as I have further declared, *Sect.* 7. towards the end. I note alſo that all that I here in the laſt Sections cited out of the Fathers for the Infallibility of the Church in Her Traditions and Councils, muſt needs be ſpoken of no other Church

then

then of ſuch an one as did not diſclaim from Infallibility; But all Churches, but the *Roman*, diſclaimed from Infallibility; therefore they Taught no other Church but the *Roman* to be Infallible. If you ask why they muſt needs teach no Church to be Infallible which diſclaimed from being ſo, I have given you a moſt evident Reaſon thereof, *Sect.* 17.

3. This note ſhews that the Fathers muſt needs have, in thoſe ſayings of theirs, concerning Infallibility, underſtood the *Roman* Church, and could underſtand no other differing from Her. But indeed (as I have ſaid;) their very Vulgar Phraſe of the Catholick Church, was known then to be applied to the *Roman*, taken in the ſenſe we ſpoke of. Hence that Old *Arian Jocundus* ſaid to King *Theodorick*; *If you put* Armogaſtes (a Catholick) *to Death, the* Romans (that is the Catholicks,) *will proclaim him a* Martyr, as Witneſſes *Victor Uti. de Perſec. Vand. Lib.* 1. Hence alſo *Ricemer*, another *Arian*, did Write unto the *Gennenſes*. *If he be a* Catholick, *he is a* Roman. And St. Greg. of Tours *Lib.* 1. *de gloria* Martyr. *cap.* 25. Telling how *Theodegeſilus* an *Arian* King of *Portugal*, ſaid, ſuch a Miracle *was a trick of the* Romans; he adds this Parentheſis; *For they call the Men of our Religion* Romans. So he. This then was the Vulgar Old Stile: Thus ſpoke Antiquity. *If he be one of* Christs *Sheep, he is one of St.* Peters *Succeſſor's Flock*; as I ſhewed out of St. *Chryſoſtome*; If he be of the Catholick Church, *he is one of the People united to the chief Prieſt*; as I ſhewed out of St. *Cyprian*. If mention be made of one *to whom the charge of Governing the* Church *is given*, the Biſhop of *Rome* is underſtood in the Vulgar Language of the Primitive Church, as I ſhewed out of *Bede*, St. *Gregor*, St. *Irenæus*. If a St. *Hierome* would tell you, who were of his Church or Communion, he underſtands *every one joined to the* Chair *of* St. Peter; For *upon this Rock he knows the* Church *is Built*. If a St. *Leo* ſpeaks of one who has the *charge of the Univerſal* Church, he means the Biſhop *who ſits in the* Chair of St. Peter

ter. If a St. *Hierome* will ſignifie a *Damaſus* Biſhop of *Rome*, he will do it by calling him, *The Rector of the Houſe of God, which is the* Church, *the Pillar and Foundation of Truth.* If a St. *Ambroſe*, or his Brother, be to pick out among Schiſmaticks, a Biſhop who is a true Member of the Catholick Church, he will do it by asking, *whether he agrees with the* Catholick *Biſhop:* And he will tell you that in plain Terms by that Name he means the *Roman* Church. And if a St. *Cyprian* be to ſpeak of a *Cornelius* Biſhop of the *Roman* Church, he will explicate himſelf in currant Language, by calling *him Biſhop of the* Catholick Church, he being notoriouſly known to be that *one Biſhop which muſt be at all times in the* Church, and *no Man can confide that he is in the* Catholick Church *who forſakes the* Chair *of* St. Peter. You need not then wonder to hear me ſay, that by thoſe who are in the Catholick Church, we mean thoſe who have not forſaken, but cleave faſt to the Chair of St. *Peter*, *for on this Apoſtolical Seat* Chriſt *has Built the Univerſal* Church, as the moſt Ancient *Anacletus* has told you. Hence a St. *Auſtin* (*Epiſt.* 162.) will tell *Cecilian*, that he needs not fear the conſpiring Multitude of *African* Biſhops, as long as he Communicated with *Melchiades* the Pope. Hence, *Optatus*, *L.* 2. *contra Petilianum.* will thruſt the *Donatiſts* out of the number of Catholicks, *becauſe they Communicated not with the* Roman Church: And he himſelf will adhear to *Sericius* the Pope *to whom all the World was United.* All the World then were *Papiſts*; and thoſe counted Hereticks who refuſed to be ſo. And in this ſenſe not to be a *Papiſt*, that is not to be one United in Communion to the Pope, was the ſelf ſame as not to be Catholick; for all the Catholick World was United to the Pope or Head-Paſtor of CHRIST'S Flock.

4. Beſides all this, you muſt know, that the Fathers did not alwaies forget to expreſs themſelves concerning the Infallibility of the Church of *Rome* by Name, or as ſignificantly as if they had put that Name. In my 19. *Sect. n.* 7. I cited

St.

St. *Auſtens* Words at large to prove that God has left ſome ſuch Authority unto us; *that by it, as by a well aſſured ſtep we may be lifted up to God:* And hence he concludes that no Man ſhould doubt to betake himſelf to the Lapp of the *Roman* Church, for this Church you will find his Words evidently to deſcribe. Read then and you cannot deny it. Again, *Pſal.* in *Partem Donati* he ſpeaks thus of St. *Peters* Chair. *She is that Rock which the proud Gates of Hell cannot vanquiſh.* And St. *Cyprian*, Ep. 55. n. 6. *They are ſo bold as to carry Letters from prophane Schiſmaticks to the* Chair of Peter *and the principal* Church *whence Prieſtly Unity roſe, not conſidering the* Romans *to be them, whoſe Faith* (the Apoſtle being the Commender thereof,) *was praiſed, to whom misbelief cannot have acceſs* And St. *Hierome*, Apologia Adver. Ruff. L. 3. cap. 4. *Know you that the* Roman *Faith commended by the Apoſtles Mouth, will receive no ſuch Deceits, nor can poſſibly be chang'd tho' an Angel Taught otherwiſe.* Our Adverſaries commonly receive the Sixth Synod Celebrated, *An.* 680. in which, after the Epiſtle of *Agatho* the Pope had been Read. (*Act.* 4.) It was confirmed by theſe Words, (Act. 8.) *This is the true Rule of Faith which the Apoſtolical* Church of Chriſt *has vigorouſly held and ſtill defends; which* Church *ſhall never be proved to have Erred from the* Path of *Apoſtolical Tradition:* (And that you may know this was to hold true for ever, the Council adds,) *according to the Divine promiſe of our Lord and Saviour, I have prayed for thee that thy Faith may not fail.* Here you have the very Phraſe we now uſe of impoſſibility of Erring grounded in the Divine Promiſe. What is this called but Infallibility? The ſame Divine Promiſe is juſt ſo applied to St. *Peters* Succeſſors, by St. *Leo Serm.* 3. in *Anniver. ſuæ Aſſum.* If we will ſpeak with Antiquity, here is *Aperta promiſſio*, a manifeſt promiſe that the Paſtor of the Church, St. *Peters* Succeſſor, proceeding as Univerſal Paſtor, or defining in a

Council neither ſhall, nor can fail, for which promiſe Dr. *Ferne*, *Sect.* 27. calls ſo earneſtly.

5. By this time my Reader will ſee how exceeding little Reaſon our Adverſaries have to take for a ſtrong Argument againſt Infallibility the deep ſilence of Antiquity, (as they ſpeak) in this point; whereas I in a very ſhort time, with my ſmall Reading, have been able ſo to weary out my Reader with the plentiful Authorities of Antiquity, that he will eaſily remember hereafter what juſt Indignation ought to be conceived againſt this groſs Falſity.

SECTION XXIII.

Some things very neceſſary for the eaſier anſwering our Adverſaries Objections.

1. BEfore I begin any one of our Adverſaries Objections I muſt (to take away all prejudice) intreat my Reader in the whole Reading of this next Section to note, *Firſt*, How Infallibly all the Chriſtian World, (except ſome few *Socinians*) affirm themſelves to believe all things contained in thoſe Books which they hold Canonical Scripture. And yet I will undertake that any Judicious Man in the World, who with a calm, ſober, and diſintereſſed Mind ſhall attentively ponder on the one ſide what they object againſt the Infallibility of the Church and then on the other ſide, all thoſe exceeding many places of Scipture which ſeem ſo manifeſtly contrary to one another, that the greateſt wits that ever yet were, could never clear them ſo, but ſtill the difficulty which remains is ſo very great that no full ſatisfaction would ever be received if Mens Wills were bent as reſolutely to receive no anſwer, but a manifeſt one againſt the Infallibilty of Scripture

as

as the Wills of Proteſtants are bent to reject all we can ſay in anſwer to their Objections againſt Infallibility of the Church, unleſs our anſwers be more manifeſtly evident then the Noon-Sun ſhine: Wherefore in this matter due reſpect to Divine Authority makes us alwaies ſo far ſubmit our Underſtandings, by force of our will, that, if the contrary be not (as I may ſay) more then evident, we are reſolved to yield no aſſent unto it. Any Man who ſhould ponder this on the one ſide, and then with due attention conſider on the other ſide how very few the Objections againſt the Infallibility of the Church be, in compariſon of the Objections againſt the Infallibility of Scripture, and with how much Sweat and Labour theſe be ſcarce ſolved at laſt? Whereas the others be anſwered ſo that nothing like evidence can be brought againſt them, eſpecially if Men would come to look upon theſe Objections, as upon ſo many weak difficulties of Humane Reaſon againſt an Authority, which ſo ſtrongly can prove Her participation of Divine Verity, having for the evidence thereof twelf ſtrong Texts of Scripture related *Sect.* 14. 15. So many invincible Reaſons related *Sect.* 16. So many unanſwerable Teſtimonies of Holy Fathers as have been related theſe four laſt Sections, He (I ſay) who would thus on both ſides conſider the matter, would find it even impoſſible for him in his Conſcience to deny that the Objections againſt the Infallibility of the Church be any waies either ſo many in number or ſo inſuperable to Humane Capacity as the Objections be which may be made againſt the Infallibility of Scripture.

2 And becauſe this Obſervation and Note is of great moment to make the *Proteſtant* Reader ſee, that it is more his own prejudice againſt the Churches Infallibility, which ſtands in his light, then any ſolid Reaſon; I will alleadge an Objection or two, which poor weak Humane Reaſon, moves againſt the Divine Infallibility of all that is contained in undoubted Scripture. We need not go far to find theſe Objections. Even in the firſt Chapter of the firſt Goſpel I find a difficulty

ſo great, that tho' I have (as I fully think,) moſt carefully ſought ſatisfaction concerning it, in thirty or more of the beſt Interpreters, yet I could find no anſwer half ſo ſatisfactory, as I, with my poor Ability, hope to give to the very ſtrongeſt Objection that I could ever yet ſee made againſt the Infallibility of the Church, taking the Church in the ſenſe which I explicated *Sect.* 18. The Objection is this, which you may touch with your Fingers. It is ſaid *Mat.* 1. *v.* 17. *All the* Generations *from* Abraham *to* David *are fourteen* Generations, *and from* David *untill the carrying away into* Babylon *are fouteen Generations: And from the carrying away into* Babylon *unto* CHRIST *are fourteen Generations.* This is the Infallible Text. Now take your Fingers, and count with as great Infallibility, as you can count, fourteen Names ſet down in fair Print before your Eyes. In the firſt foureen you will find *Abraham* to be the firſt, and *David* to be the laſt. Theſe you muſt not count over again in the ſecond fourteen. So that *Solomon* is the firſt of the ſecond fourteen, and *Jechonias* is the laſt; and as *David* was not to be counted in the ſecond fourteen, becauſe he was already once counted in the firſt, ſo alſo *Jechonias* muſt not be counted once more in the third fourteen, becauſe he has been once before counted in the ſecond fourteen; whence it followes that the firſt in the third fourteen is *Salathiel* the Son of *Jechonias*, and the laſt muſt needs be *Chriſt* himſelf, ſo that you muſt find twelve more Generations between *Salathiel* the firſt and *Chriſt* the laſt, or elſe (ſayes Humane Reaſon) Infallibly you have not fourteen Generations as St. *Matt.* ſays, you have. It is a ſmall Labour for you to ſee whether you have twelf more, or no? Lay every ſeveral Finger upon every ſeveral Name, and if you have ten Fingers, two Names muſt remain untouched, or elſe you will not have twelf. I touched my Thumb upon the name of *Salathiel*, whom I have proved to be the firſt of the laſt fourteen, then I touched the name of *Zorobabel* with my Fore-finger, and thus having touched all my ten Fin-

Fingers at the ten following Names, I could not possibly see any more Names to touch but the Name of *Joseph*. When Reason told me that seemed to the very Eye to be a Demonstration that *Salathiel*, who was the first of this last foureen having but eleven more following him to *Christ*, could not (with *Christ*) make up the last fourteen. How then, if this be Infallibly true, comes that also to be Infallibly true which St. *Matthew* sayes contrary to this, calling these last thirteen Generations as clearly fourteen as he called the former.

3. Again St. *Luke* setting down the Genealogy of *Christ* sayes *cap.* 3. *v.* 35, 36. Salah *which was the Son of* Cainan *which* (Cainan) *was the Son of* Arphaxad. And all the Greek Copies of the New Testament read thus, conformable to all the Greek Copies of the Old Testament, *Gen.* 11. *v.* 12. Yet if you turn to this place in *Genesis*, translated Faithfully by our Vulgar, and your own Bible, you shall not find that *Cainan* was the Son of *Arphaxad*, as St. *Luke* sayes, but you shall find these words; *And Arphaxad lived five and thirty Years and begot* Salah, whereas this *Salah*, was the Son of *Cainan*, according to St. *Luke*, and not the Son of *Arphaxad*. If you say this *Salah* was *Arphaxad* Son, because *Arphaxad* was his Grand-Father. I pray note that *Arphaxad* is said to have begot him, when he was *Five and thirty Years Old*, whereas if you mark, even that Chapter of *Genesis*, you shall see no one there mentioned who had a Son before thirty Years Old; for as in those daies they lived very long, so it was long before they used then to Marry. Again, there is yet a far greater difficulty, that the Greek Copy of the Old Testament, which St. *Luke* followed, reads thus; *And* Arphaxad *lived five and thirty Years and begat* Cainan, so that, if *Arphaxad* were Grand Father to *Salah*, because he begot his Father *Cainan*, when he himself *was five and thirty Years Old*, (in which Year of his Age your Bible and ours say he begat *Salah*,) thus *Salah* his Grand Child, and *Cainan* his Father, must be Born the same Year, which, saies Reason, is Infallibly false. Now, if you say *Cainan* is to be omitted

ac-

according to ſome Greek Copies in the Old Teſtament, yet what will you ſay to all the Copies of the New Teſtament, which moſt unanimouſly put him down. Here Venerable *Bede* profeſſes himſelf to admire that which his dulneſs cannot underſtand. And indeed I think no Man underſtands it. And the Reaſon is more gravelled and quite non-pluſhed at another contradiction, which ſeems to Her unavoidable. Turn in your Bible to the 2 *Kings*, *cap.* 8. *v.* 26. There you Read *Two and twenty Years Old was* Ahazia *when he began to* Reign, *and he* Reigned *one Year in* Jeruſalem, *and his Mothers Name was* Athaliah. Now turn to *Chron.* 2. *cap.* 22. *v.* 2. And ſee if a very different Story be not alſo true Scripture. For thus you ſhall Read, *Forty and two Years Old was* Ahazia *when he began to* Reign, *and he* Reigned *one Year in* Jeruſalem, *his Mothers Name was* Athaliah. Againſt the Infallibility then of Scripture, Reaſon conceives Her ſelf to have this Infallible Demonſtration: No one is Infallible in ſpeech who ſpeaks two things quite contrary one to another; but theſe two ſpeeches be quite contrary, when of the ſame Man one affirms. *He began to* Reign *when he was two and twenty Years Old*; and another affirms, *that he was fourty two Years Old;* Therefore the Scripture is not Infallible in ſpeech.

4. Here by the way reflect (dear Reader) how Demonſtratively falſe it is which our Adverſaries ſay, that by the only knowledge of Scripture a Man may clearly be inſtructed in all Fundamental or neceſſary points: Now I ask, whether any point be with you more Fundamental or more neceſſary then this is; *The Scripture is Infallible*? But this point is ſo far from being clearly deduced out of the reading of the Scripture, that he, who ſhall read theſe three places, ſhall ſee with his Eyes that theſe places alone make this Verity more obſcure then any place of Scripture makes the contrary evident; for Reaſon, left to Her ſelf, will ſooner ſhift of any place you can cite for the evidence of the Scriptures Infallibility, then you ſhall be able to ſhift off the places cited. I

do

do not put the anſwer to thoſe three places, that the Reader may, by his own experience, ſee how true it is that all that concerns neceſſary points is not clear in Scripture; for what point more neceſſary then that the Scripture is Infallible, and what point has ſuch unanſwerable difficulty as theſe be? If you could but bring half ſo clear a Demonſtration againſt the Infallibility of the Church, how would you Triumph? All that could be ſaid by us would never ſatisfie you. And yet here you muſt be ſatisfied, or grant Scripture in it ſelf not to be Infallible. What Fondneſs then, for incomparable weaker Objections, to ſtand out ſo perniciouſly againſt the Infallibility of the Church. Note this and you will ſoon not your own prepoſterious dealing.

5. *Secondly*, I muſt ſet down here a note which according to good method, ſome might have expected in the begining of this Queſtion of Infallibility; but had it been put down there, it might have been ſubject to have been forgoten before we ſhould have come to make chief uſe of it, which is to be done in this next Section. This Second note then is this, that my Reader muſt be made capable of what kind of Infallibility we ſpeak, when we ſay; *the Church, in Her Traditions, and Definitions is Infallible;* or that theſe Traditions and Definitions deliver Infallible Verities unto us. This point is learnedly declared by our learned Country Man *Bacon in analyſi Fidei Diſp.* 3. *cap.* 7. citing divers ſolid Divines for this Doctrine. We ſay then, that our Act of Faith, by which we believe the Church, propoſing any thing to us by Her Traditions or Definitions, is Infallible in this ſenſe; that this Act of Faith is begot by ſuch cauſes as do ſecure it from all kind of Error: So that the underſtanding, which is informed, or made knowing by this Act, ought to adhear ſo ſtrongly to what ſuch an Act affirmes to be true, that though an Angel from Heaven ſhould ſay the contrary, this underſtanding would never be brought to aſſent to him. So firm adheſion flows from an Act ſecured ſo well from Error by the cauſes which did

pro-

produce it, I ſay with great reflection that this underſtanding by this Act is ſo affected that the party *would not be brought* by the Preaching of an Angel to believe the contrary, and I did not ſay that it *could not be brought.* For tho' the Nature of evident knowledge ſhewing that a thing is ſo, makes that the party *cannot aſſent to the contrary;* yet this Infallible Act of Faith, only makes a Man ſo affected that *he will not ceaſe from adhearing* ſo ſtrongly to what he believes, as long as this Act remains unretracted. This firmneſs of adheſion ſprings from the great value and eſteem which we put (deſervedly,) upon the cauſes moving him to this aſſent. And this is the true Reaſon why you will by no means be brought to doubt of the Infallibility of the Scripture by any ſtrong Objection, that your natural Reaſon makes, when ſhe ſuggeſts ſuch Objections as I juſt now framed, meer pertinaciouſneſs alſo and a falſe fancy of the value of the cauſes by which even Hereticks pretend to be moved to their Errors, makes many rather looſe their lives, then forſake to ſtick cloſe to what they imagine to be Gods Word: Shall not then a prudent eſteem, ſolidly grounded concerning the Divine Authority, moving to the Belief of theſe and theſe points, be able to make a Man adhear ſo cloſely to them as I ſaid? When then my underſtanding has Motives, tho' not wholly Infallible, yet ſuch as cauſe a moſt prudent aſſent *that God has ſaid ſuch a thing;* and this is made ſo evidently credible unto me, that in prudence I cannot think it to be otherwaies, and Heaven is alſo by moſt highly valuable promiſes, offered me, if I will aſſent to this, with that reſpect which is due to GODS Word, and Hell on the contrary is threatned unto me by moſt truly formidable menaces, if I will not aſſent to this Verity as to a Verity affirmed by God; am I not rather ſtark Mad, then Imprudent only, if I will not bend my underſtanding by force of my Will to adhear with all its Power to this Verity, as to a Verity affirmed by God, and eſteem it as ſuch a Verity ought to be eſteemed. Wherefore, as it is Blaſphemous Impiety to ſuſpect that the very leaſt

leaſt danger of Falſity can be in a thing affirmed by God; ſo becauſe the Reaſons I alledged make me carry my ſelf ſo towards that (which is thus propoſed to me to believe) as towards a Verity revealed by God, the ſelf ſame Reaſons do make me conſequently more willing to deny any natural Evidence, that I can have, then to give way to the entertainment of any ſuſpicion of Fallibility in this which I have received as Gods own Word, as indeed it is, See *Sect.* 16. *numb.* 6.

6. Now that which I mainly inſiſt upon is this, ſuch an Infallibility of Adheſion as this Act is, cannot be lyable, or any way ſubject to uncertainty, no more then the Infallibility of that Man whom God had fully reſolved ſo to guide, and direct, in all that he ſhould ſay or write, that he would never permit him to ſay or write the leaſt falſity, altho' this Man never knew nor ſuſpected himſelf to have this Privledge. Juſt ſo, tho', we neither feel, nor by evidence know the Infallibility of our aſſent, our Act of aſſent will be Infallible, if God really concur unto it by ſuch Principles as are no way lyable to Error. All the difficulty then in proving this our aſſent to be Infallible, conſiſts in this, whether or no we can prove that God concurs to this aſſent by ſuch Principles as are no way lyable to Error? To prove this we muſt prove that our aſſent has for its Object not only an apparent Revelation, but alſo a Revelation certainly true, and not only true caſually (by out hiting by chance upon ſuch an Object as is truly revealed by God) but it muſt be of ſuch a nature that it cannot in theſe circumſtances guide me to aſſent to any thing but that which cannot but be truly revealed. This then I prove thus. Altho' there might be imagined ſuch circumſtances in which God could let me have all the motives which ſo Powerfully move to believe that ſuch and ſuch a point is revealed by God, altho' this were not ſo; yet ſuppoſing that the Divine Providence has reſolved never to permit (in the circumſtances in which Men now live,) any falſity to be commended to our

Belief by ſo Powerful Motives as theſe be, *to wit*, Miracles, full report of Millions and Millions, Teaching uniformly the ſame points to have been delivered down to them, by Millions atteſting that they received them as delivered from the Apoſtles, and thus going up untill we come to them who teſtifie that with their own Ears they heard all theſe points delivered by them, and did ſee them Work Worlds of Miracles in Confirmation of them, that they did hear thoſe ſimple Men refute all Philoſophers, ſpeak all Languages, tell the very ſecrets of the Heart, foretell things to come without ever miſſing, *&c.* ſuppoſing I ſay that the Divine Providence is reſolved never to let any falſity cloak her ſelf with theſe Powerful Motives, theſe Motives muſt needs be the certain Liveries of Truth, and that which comes veſted in them, cannot be any thing but Truth. And this holds good whether I be, or be not aſſured, that the Divine Providence is reſolved never to permit any falſity to be thus recommended to us. For it is not our knowing that no falſity will ever be permitted by God to be thus recommended to us, which is the cauſe why no falſity can be thus recommended: But it is meerly the extrinſecal Will of God, determining to provide ſo for our ſure guidance to that end, for which he Created us, that hence he comes to reſolve not to permit at any time, any falſity to be ſo Powerfully recommended unto us, as it ſhould be by theſe Motives of Credibility which he ſets apart for his peculiar uſe of delivering the Verities of our Faith unto us, as we ſet the uſe of our Seales apart for Ratifying only ſuch things as we intend to acknowledge for our own true deeds.

7. If you ask me, how I can prove that God has reſolved never to permit any falſity to be recommended by theſe Motives, by which the Verities of our Faith are recommended? I anſwer that *firſt*, the Motives which recommended the Verities of our Faith, do convince that which is ſo recommended to be Morally certain: As the full report of all Men from all parts of *England* make it Morally certain, that there is ſuch

ſuch a City as *London*, to thoſe who never came near *London* by a hundred Miles. How much then would it misbeſeem the Divine Verity and Goodneſs, to concur to the making of a falſity, ſo credible as it is credible to all Men, that there is ſuch a City as *London?* But *Secondly*, it would far more misbeſeem him to make no leſs aſſured offers of Heaven to thoſe who would believe a Lie thus recommended, and threaten Hell unto them without they would embrace ſuch a Lie, even for a Verity revealed by God, which threats were as certainly to be feared, as *London* is certainly to be believed to be in *England* by thoſe who have not ſeen *London*. *Thirdly*, it is evident that God can impoſe an Obligation upon Man to follow the true Religion as a means neceſſary to obtain his Salvation, which Religion may propoſe ſome Verities to be believed as Divine, and as things revealed by God: Now, ſuppoſing our Nature and preſent Condition, (I may boldly ſay,) either that Belief which is recommended by ſuch Motives as ours are, muſt be this true Religion, or you cannot aſſign unto me any other kind of Belief, recommended by any other kind of Motives, which can make it ſeem ſo credible to me as our Religion. It is impoſſible that a meer Lie ſhould be ſo much more credible then Gods true Word, as our Religion is abſolutly more credible then any falſe Belief; for this would breed a notable diſparagement and diſeſteem of the Divine Authority, making it of leſs credit then a Lie. How can that God, who has a ſerious Will to oblige us, to embrace that Belief as Divine, which is the only true Way appointed by him to lead us to Heaven, have a Will alſo directly deſtructive of this Will? That is, how can he have a Will to permit the Lies, oppoſite to what he would have us believe, to be in all Reaſon made more credible by the Motives which recommend them, then thoſe Verities are which according to Reaſon he would have us embrace, not only for Verities, but for Verities affirmed by him; *that is*, for Infallible Verities? So that you ſee at laſt we have brought it to a plain

contradiction, to ſay, that (ſuppoſing our Nature and the preſent circumſtances appointed, *de facto*, by the Divine Providence,) our Religion recommended by the foreſaid Motives, ſhould be falſe in this preſent State, whatſoever it might have been in ſome other State, which God could have choſen if he would have had no Providence concerning us: To which Providence I confeſs nothing could oblige him.

8. Suppoſing then no more then what is evident both by Scripture and Reaſon, that God is reſolved to have a Providence over us, and to bring us to the end for which he made us by the Belief of ſeveral Verities which he has revealed; it is impoſſible that as long as he has this Will, he ſhould not alſo have a Will to recommend to our Belief theſe Verities, (which he would have us believe,) by ſuch Motives, as no Lie can come recommended by him as long as he ſtill intends to uſe this Providence towards us. The Acts then of our Faith are Infallible, becauſe really (whether the party who believes knows it or no,) theſe Acts proceed from ſuch cauſes as are uncapable (in theſe preſent circumſtances) of recommending any thing that is falſe: But they ſtill recommend that which is atteſted not by any apparent, but by a moſt true Revelation made by *Chriſts* Apoſtles to the Church; which Church alſo is, by the like Motives, recommended as Infallible, and we evidently, by our very ſenſes, know what this Church certainly Teaches: Whereas, tho' all which the Scripture ſaies be Infallible, yet we have not only no Infallibility, but even no very probable certainty of our underſtanding the Scripture in the true ſenſe in many neceſſary points, except it be by the Inſtruction of the Church; as has fully been ſhewed, *Sect.* 7.

9. Now beſides theſe exterior Principles of our aſſent, by which I ſay we believe with an Infallible Belief the Articles of our Faith, we muſt here note that the aſſent it ſelf is never produced (even by thoſe who have the Habit of true Faith,) unleſs it be by the Supernatural Illumination of God, Elevating us to all that has immediate relation to the Supernatural State

State of Heavenly Glory, whence St. *Paul* Teaches us that in order to attain this High-State, *we are not ſufficient of our ſelves to think any thing as of our ſelves, but our ſufficiency is from God*, 2 *Cor.* 3. *v.* 5. Every time that a true Believer exerciſes an Act of true Faith; God, of his Infinite Goodneſs, affords this Supernatural Light infuſing it unto the underſtanding to Elevate it, and inable it, to produce the Supernatural Act of Faith. Yet when a Man has not this Supernatutal aſſiſtance in his Act, he cannot tell, be he never ſo Learned. This all may know, that God does never give this Supernatural help to believe any thing, which is not really delivered by a true Revelation made to the Apoſtles, otherwaies he might be ſaid to give Supernatural aid to believe a Lie.

10. Out of all this diſcourſe, that appears to be true, which we moſt deſire to be noted, that our Acts of Faith may be moſt truly Infallible and are proved to be ſo, becauſe they proceed from Cauſes ſo determining to that only which is true, that they cannot determine our aſſent to any falſity, and that all this happens thus, altho' we cannot evidently know when we believe Infallibly.

SECT-

SECTION XXIV.

Twenty Objections of an Univerſity Man againſt the Infallibility of the Church, *and alſo ſome others are ſolved.*

1. AFter I had reſolved on this Treatiſe I did Read in the Preface of an Univerſity Man to a Work of *John Dailles*, ſet forth to excuſe the Reformed Churches from Schiſms, twenty Objections urged with ſo great confidence againſt the Infallibility of the Church, that at the end of his Preface he promiſes to turn *Papiſt* if ſuch Objections be punctually anſwered; but withall he would have yet one Argument more ſolved. I ſhall endeavour to give him a little more large ſatisfaction then he requires. For I will alſo return him anſwer to all that concerns this point either in this or any other part of his Preface.

2. *Firſt* then P. 22. he would overthrow all we have ſaid of the Churches being our Judge in Controverſies becauſe ſo little is ſaid againſt Hereticks, for denying this by St. *Epiphanius* and St. *Auſten*, to which I have abundantly anſwered, *Sect.* 2. As alſo he would have us condemned by the ſilence of *Tertullian*, which I have anſwered *Sect.* 20. *n.* 9. fine, and by the like ſilence of *Vincen Lerinen.* which I have anſwered *Sect.* 7. What you add of *Optatus* and St. *Auſten*, who found againſt their Adverſaries no Judge upon Earth (as you ſay) but Scripture, you muſt note that they ſpoke as they did, not becauſe the Faithful People were not provided of another Infallible Judge, but becauſe thoſe contentious Fellows againſt whom they ſpoke did (as *Optatus* intimates) make no account of the Churches contrary Judgment as the Jews make no account

count of our new Teſtament: Wherefore as, when Doctors or Fathers diſpute againſt *Jews*, they do not ſtand preſſing them with the Authority of the New Teſtament, tho' they themſelves hold it of Infallible Authority (becauſe they know the *Jews* ſcoff at ſuch Authorities) ſo St. *Auſten* here, and formerly cited by you, as alſo *Optatus*, did not ſtand preſſing their Adverſaries with the Authority of the Church, which they themſelves held Infallible, becauſe they knew thoſe Hereticks would as much ſcoff at them as the *Jews* would ſcoff at thoſe who ſhould preſs the Authority of the New Teſtament, and as you uſe to ſcoff at us if we only cite the Council of *Trent* againſt you. Wherefore you ſee that I, who ſo clearly hold the Church our Infallible Judge, do not take any Text of the Council of *Trent* for my Argument to prove this, tho' I hold that Council Infallible.

3. Again, you Object St. *Pauls* making no mention of this Judge in his Epiſtle to the *Romans:* In which I am ſure he does not alſo tell them that the Scripture only muſt be taken for Judge; nor does he warn them to take great heed of the Biſhops of that City, who in time would uſurp a Judicative Authority which ſhould be the Bane of Chriſtendom, as Dr. *Ferne* ſpeaks, and make all their Errors incureable, as you both ſpeak, *which news would have been worth all the reſt of his Epiſtle*, in the Judgment of thoſe who paſs their Judgment with that prophane Liberty that you do here. The Truth is, that this Judgment Seat concerned no more the *Romans*, then all the World. St. *Paul* twice Taught the Infallibility of the Church to all the World in the Texts I cited, *Sect* 15. *n.* 11. *n.* 15. That then, which no more concerned the *Romans* then all the World, was not in Reaſon to be intimated to them in particular. What you add next of the deep ſilence of the Fathers and Hiſtorians about this point, muſt needs turn to confound your Ignorance, when you ſhall have Read all I ſaid, *Sect* 18, 19, 20, 21, 22. Your enſuing Diſcourſe (for as much as concerns our Doctrine of Infalli-

bili-

bility) has had its full Anſwer in my laſt Section, by which you will ſee that when any thing is believed, which is not truly revealed, the Act of Faith can never be Infallible, and ſo no Act of Faith concerning *Proteſtaniſm* can be Infallible. Neither are we Infallible, becauſe the Acts of our Faith are Infallible, no more then all thoſe who believed *Chriſt* himſelf or his Apoſtles were Infallible. They are indeed Infallibly guided, but if they leave off being thus guided, and will become Guides, they will ſoon bewray their own Fallibility. What next concerns Infallibility, be your twenty Objections put by way of Queſtions, as ſome of them indeed are.

4. Objection 1. You ask whether there be any Infallible Judge upon Earth? I have given you a full Anſwer, *Queſt.* 1.

5. OB. 2. Whether the Church be that Judge? And why not rather ſome of thoſe ten things named by *Chilling*? I have *Queſt.* 3. *initio*, given Reaſons ſufficient for any Reaſonabbe Man, who muſt not think that in this our laſt Age he is Born ſoon enough, by a thouſand and ſix hundred Years to Teach the Church, that which no one Pariſh of the Church can ever be proved to have held. The very citing Scripture for ten ſeveral Judges (as you ſay *Chilling* does,) ſhews clearly how infinitly ſhort of ſolid Proof all other Judges Commiſſions fall in compariſon of what we have alledged for the Churches Authority in this point through the whole third Queſtion.

6. OB. 3. Whether the *Roman* Church be this Judge? Yes. See all my Proofs from *Sect.* 17. to my laſt Section.

7. OB. 4. Whether the Infallibility of this Church, be in the Head (the Pope) or in the Body; and whether in the Body Diffuſive or Collective? All this I have Anſwered, *Sect.* 18. *n.* 1, 2, 3. For as much as concerns the practical Duty of any Catholick. School ſpeculations (or Divines private Opinions) have nothing to do with neceſſary Faith.

8. OB. 5. Here your Queſtions turn to Objections, which contain in general the difficulties concerning thoſe Perſons who ought

ought to have their free Votes in a Council. Concerning this point I have ſaid ſomething, *Sect.* 18. *n.* 3. By which the Laicks and Inferiour Clergy are ſufficiently excluded, tho' theſe Clergy-mens Votes as Conſultive, or for adviſes ſake he moſt laudably demanded. When they be eminent Divines; And, for the comfort of the weaker, their ſubſcriptions may be of very good uſe and ſervice to overwhelm Hereticks, by ſuch Authority as they uſe to fear moſt, who ſlight any mention of more then Humane Authority in Councils. And becauſe amongſt all theſe inferior Clergy-Men you think the *Chor-Epiſcopi* to be moſt regarded, I will eaſily ſatisfie you concerning their ſmall Right to paſs a deciſive Voice in General Council; if you have either the Councils or the *Summ* of them by *Carranza*, you ſhall find in the Decrees of Pope *Damaſus*, as Ancient as he is, how being asked (*Epiſt.* 4.) Whether the *Chor-Epiſcopi were any thing in the* Church *of God or nothing? And what Authority they had in the* Church? And he Anſwers; *That they were nothing in the* Church *of God, in which they had no Authority, and that their Inſtitution was wicked, and too too bad, and contrary to the Sacred Canons and the Peace of the whole* Church. And therefore he defined, *that all was vain and void that they had done in the Epiſcopal Function. And that, for thoſe cauſes, they were forbidden both by the Sacred Seat,* (of Rome) *and by all the Biſhops of the World.* It follows; *How that in the Primitive* Church *theſe* Chor-Epiſcopi *did ſeem neceſſary for the peculiar care they had over the Poor, and tho' by Ordination they were only Prieſts they preſumed at laſt to exerciſe many things belonging to Biſhops, to Conſecrate Sub-Deacons, and Deacons, &c.* But their Ambition was ſoon curbed by the Church; And Biſhops were ſeverely forbidden to lay any part of their Epiſcopal Function upon them. I ſay then that only Biſhops have Right in a General Council. For of thee Prelates only it was ſaid, *He that will not hear the* Church *let him be unto thee as a Publican or Heathen.* To them only it was ſaid,

Go and Teach all Nations, and lo I am with you untill the end of the World. To them all those special Promises of Divine assistance were made, which I urged, *Sect.* 15. *n.* 14. None of these are directed to Laicks or inferior Clergy-Men, who succeeded the Disciples and not the Apostles.

9. OB: 6. Whether these Bishops assembled (with their Head and chief Pastor) be so absolutely Infallible that they cannot determine falsely in point of Faith let them do what they will? I answer, that, as I shewed *Sect.* 19. *n.* 1. 2. they are to regulate themselves according to Scripture and Tradition discussing carefully what has been revealed to the Church by these means, concerning the points which they treat of. See the place I cited and you will see how notoriously manifest their proceedings must needs be; but they must be the Judges, and not we, that they have done their duty in regulating themselves according to those two Infallible Rules yet we are secured that they have done their duty both by the notorious Publicity of the fact and by their subscriptions to the legal carriage of all that essentially concernes the being of a true Councils; and also by seeing no considerable part of the Church diffused, refuse their Decrees. Fear not you to do, what you see all the Church do, with so Universal a consent: Neither will I press you to consent, untill you first see this General consent go before you. Were there any notorious neglect of legal proceeding to the introducing of Error, the whole Church Representative and Diffusive, would never be permited by God, to submit chearfully thereunto. I might ask how shall I know the Scripture-Writers did their duty in Obeying the Divine Inspiration? If they did not: Adieu all Faith.

10. OB: 7. How shall I know when they determine a right? what is required to a Synodical Constitution? Must all concur in the vote, or will the major part serve the turn? I answer you shall know all these things to have been done as they should be, by seeing that all have subscribed to the Councils as proceeding legally in her Constitutions, which also you may

may ſtay to ſee accepted by the Church for Lawful Decrees. When you ſee this done, without any conſiderable contradiction, I hope you will think you may prudently ſubmit, and cannot but imprudently ſtand out any longer. And for your particular we will condeſcend to you to ſtand out ſo long. When you are to be ſo leading a Man of whole Provinces, that your ſubmiſſion would be required before any of theirs it will be a longer work to tell you all belonging to your duty. What belongs to you at preſent I have told you in order to practice. The conſtant practice of the Church has ſufficiently informed the leading Men Governors of the Church how they are to proceed in doing that which ſo many Ages have practiſed before them.

11. OB. 8. What makes a General Council; muſt all the Biſhops of the World be called? I anſwer that makes a General Council which has, ever ſince the primative Church, ſerved to make all the General Council which have been made. Look on the firſt Council in the Apoſtles time, and you will find not all the Apoſtles but only *Peter*, *Iames*, *Iohn*, *Paul*, *and Barnaby* preſent. See *Baron. An* 51. And yet their Decrees ſent to all Churches did bear this Preface. *It has ſeemed good to the Holy Ghoſt and us.* In the four firſt Councils (which your *Engliſh* Church admits,) the fourth part of the Biſhops was never preſent, and in the Councils kept in the Eaſt few Biſhops appeared from the Weſt, and to the Councils kept in the Weſt few Biſhops came commonly from the Eaſt. The practice of the Church (the beſt Interpreter of Divine Laws) teaches that it ſuffices that all who can conveniently be called and ſummonned do appear, and that ſuch a competent number appear and ſit in Council as thoſe (who are aſſembled together with their head) Judge ſufficient on the one ſide; and on the other ſide that thoſe who be not preſent, knowing well enough (as we ſee by experience of the appearance made in Parliament how all Men know how great or little it is) thoſe I ſay knowing how great or little the apperance of Biſhops is in the Council, ſay nothing againſt it,

but ſilently conſent to permit them to proceed as a ſufficient Repreſentative of the Church and accordingly admit of their Decrees when they are made.

12. OB. 9. Whether it be a Lawful Council if all come not who are called? I have made my anſwer already that it is ſufficient that a ſufficient number comes; that is, a number approved for ſufficient by the Church in the manner I now expreſſed.

13. OB. 10. Who muſt call the General Council? The Pope, or Chriſtian Kings and Emperours? And how ſhall I be aſſured which of them muſt? I anſwer that it is evident out of Scripture that there is no Divine Inſtitution by which either Emperours, or Kings be aſſured to be ſtill found in the World; or that (when they have that dignity) they be, by Divine Inſtitution, inveſted with a Power to call Councils. We ſeek for this Divine Inſtitution This we will not admit until it can be ſhewed in Scripture or Tradition. The Fact of calling ſhews not Divine Inſtitution. Secondly, as for the Prelates of the Church we can ſhew Divine Inſtitution. *Act.* 20. 28. *Biſhops placed by the Holy Ghoſt over all the Flock to feed or Govern the Church of God.* And 4. *Eph.* Not Lay-Magiſtrates but only Eccleſiaſtical are ſaid to be *given us by Chriſt for the Work of the Miniſtery, for the edifying the Body of Chriſt, that henceforth we may not be carried about with every Wind of Doctrine, &c. Thirdly,* the Emperour is not by Divine Inſtitution Lord of the Chriſtian World no nor of any conſiderable part of it, wherefore ſeeing that a motive power is no motive power any further then it can or ought to be able to Move; the Emperial power which neither can nor ought to move further then it Reigns, cannot conſequently command any further then his territory at the uttermoſt. The Power of the chief Paſtor of the Univerſal Church is coextended to the Univerſal Church. All Biſhops of the Univerſal Church being to be moved muſt be moved by ſuch a power as this is. If Emperours called Councils; it was not by any Eccleſiaſtical calling (ſuch an one as

the

the Pope called them by at the very ſelf ſame time) but the Emperous calling, was only political, proceeding from a temporal power, ſubſerving to the Eccleſiaſtical, and not able to force them by cenſure in caſe of refuſing to come, as the Eccleſiaſtical power could, which power implored the Emperial aſſiſtance to concur with Her, only for the more effectual Execution. Perhaps ſometimes Emperors might venture to call dependently of the ratification of the ſupream Paſtor, which they preſumed would be eaſily obtained in ſo juſt neceſſities as then ſeemed to preſs for a ſpeedy Remedy. If Emperors or Kings were preſent in Council, it was only by their preſence and good Countenance to honour, encourage, and further the proceedings of the Council, and not to paſs their Vote in points of Belief.

14. OB: 11. How far be the Councils determination Infallible? Whether in matters of Fact as well as Faith? I anſwer that they be Infallible only in matters of Faith. Matters of Fact have no ground for their having been done ſo, or not done ſo, either in Scripture or Tradition; Wherefore concerning matters of Fact the Church Rules herſelf by no former Revelation, and ſhe pretends to no new Revelations; but only to declare clearly what ſhe finds to have before been revealed. The Infallibility was thus promiſed to the Church, *He ſhall teach you all things and ſuggeſt all things whatſoever I ſhall ſay unto you.* Things of Fact are ſaid and teſtified only by Men; therefore not objects of Faith.

15. OB. 12. Whether in theſe matters of Faith the Church be Infallible in Fundamentals only? I anſwer, that in all the Authorities which I cited for the Infallibility of the Church out of Scripture *Sect.* 14 *n.* 3 &c. and 15. I ſhewed that they are groundleſly reſtrained to only Fundamentals in the ſenſe you mean. The ſame was proved by my Reaſons *Sect.* 16.

16. OB: 13. How ſhall I Infallibly know what points are Fundamental what not? I anſwer this Queſtion may poſe thoſe who will be reſtraining the General promiſes of Infalli-

ble

ble assistance made to the Church in Fundamental points only; that is unto they themselves know not what. But to us Catholicks all is Fundamental which is made appear to be proposed to us by the Church as a Verity revealed by God, whether it be in a matter more or less importing of its own nature.

OB. 14. How shall I know in time of Schism, when there be two Popes or more, which of these is St *Peters* true Successor? I answer that this Question, as explicated by you, is put very unskilfully. For you pass from arguing against the Infallibility of a Pope, as defining with a Council, to argue against those Divines who deliver not the Churches belief, but their private Opinion to be that the Pope should be held Infallible out of a Council; concerning which Opinion, I have shewed it allready to be impertinent to our purpose. Your Objection against us should be put thus. The Church (with us,) is held to be the Pope defining with a Council; But in time of Schisms, where there be more pretended Popes, we do not assuredly know that he who defines with the Council is the true Pope, or Successor of St. *Peter*. And then I answer thus, If before the calling and meeting of the Council there be more then one pretending to be Popes, that he shall ever be esteemed the right Pope, to whom the Prelates of the Church shall unanimously obey when he calls them to meet in a General Council, and in this Council to preside over them. To have two such Popes (as these are) at one time, is impossible. And this is the only time in which a Pope defines with a Lawful Council. What you say of Popes not defining in such a Council, is not our Case. Put me a Pope defining with a Lawful Council, and then prove him Fallible if you can. Whether the Popes Definitions out of a Council be Fallible or Infallible, makes nothing to this purpose. Only this is evident, if they be Infallible out of a Council, they be Infallible in a Council in all Opinions. I add with *Bellarm. Lib.* 2. *de Conciliis*, *cap.* 19. That altho'

a

a Council without a Pope cannot define any Article of Faith, yet in time of Schism, it can Judge which is true Pope, and provide the Church of a true Pastor, if She had none; who thus provided by the Councils Authority; may dissolve the Council if he pleases, or if he please to have them remain Assembled, they remain so, now by his Authority, and can define as well as other Councils called by the Pope. In that meeting in which the Pope was to be chosen, or declared the undoubted Pope, the Prelates of the Church might, and ought to meet upon their own Authority and Assemble themselves.

18. OB. 15. Suppose all agree on the Pope and a General Council meet, how shall I be sure that he, who is accounted Pope, is so indeed? For *Simonie* makes him none; and that he was not Simoniacal is impossible for me to know? and then you labour to prove that *Sixtus Quintus* was notoriously Simoniacal which makes nothing to our purpose: Neither follows it from hence that those, who being made Cardinals by him, came afterwards to be Popes, were not true Popes. For, you are too Ignorant to treat of these matters, if you know not that a Man may be a true Pope, who never was a Cardinal. To that which is pertinent, I answer, that tho' he, whose Election to the Popedom is Simoniacal, may be deposed, as having obtained that Dignity Unlawfully, yet as all Jurists say, *The Crown once obtained supplyes all Defects*, So I may far better say, that this Defect being only against Ecclesiastical Laws, may be supplied so, that of an illegal Pope, he may be afterward made a Lawful one. For, in the Church Diffusive there is Power to have this Man Pope if they will; and that they will, they testifie when they Obey his Summons calling all Bishops to a Council, and permiting him as their Head, to preside, and as Supreme Pastor to define in the Council. *Lastly*, by the Churches admission of the Council I know the Council, and consequently the Pope was as legal as is necessary.

19. OB. 16. How shall I know that those Bishops who with

with the Pope make up the Council be Biſhops indeed? For no Biſhops, no Council. Now if he, who ordained them, when he gave Orders, did not intend to give them thoſe Orders, (and whether he did or no God only knows,) then they be no Biſhops. I anſwer that if they be Biſhops, I am bound to admit their Decrees, and as he ſhould Sin damnably who would not Honour ſuch a Man held by all Men to be his true Father, becauſe it is impoſſible for him to know that his Mother did not Lie when She ſaid ſo, or to know whether it be not the Devil in his Fathers Shape, ſo I ſhould Sin damnably in not acknowledging, by due Obedience theſe to be true Fathers of Gods People who are eſteemed ſo by all the World, upon far better ground then ſuch a Man is eſteemed your Father. For *Firſt*, thoſe who ordain Biſhops or Prieſts be for the moſt part Men moſt Eminent in the Church. How is it then morally poſſible, that many ſuch Men ſhould juſt happen, in ſo many ſeveral places of the World, juſt to be the Ordainers of juſt ſuch Biſhops, as ſhould be in the Church juſt at that time, (which commonly is not above once in a Hundred Years,) when a Council is called. Again, there be more then three thouſand Biſhops at a time in the Church, (as Witneſſes *Alb. Ros. Rubric. ff. de Statu omnium*,) out of which number we ſee that it is very rare for more then three hundred to be Aſſembled at a Council, which is but every tenth Biſhop, now morally impoſſible is it that juſt every tenth Biſhop ſhould happen juſt to be that Biſhop who goes to the Council from this part of the World, (where in an Age no one Biſhop was ever heard of to be thus invalidly ordained,) and that juſt at the ſame time there ſhould come from another part of the World (where ſuch an abominable Ordination is as unheard of, as in this part) another Biſhop, whoſe ill happ it was to be thus Ordained. And thus from a third, fourth, fifth, ſixth part of the World, juſt ſuch Biſhops ſhould come in a number ſufficient to make the number of other true Biſhops unſufficient for a true Council. Surely this is a thing far more morally impoſſi-

possible then that the Common-Wealth of *England* should ever happen to have a full Parliament of Knights and Burgesses freely chosen, to the number of three hundred who should not only be all of them Bastards; but also all of them called *Iohn*. This I prove evidently: Because to confer Holy orders or Baptize without a due intention, is not only a Sin most abominable and damnable, but it is such a Sin as brings with it neither pleasure nor profit nor any thing which may the least intice any ordinary Man (much) less Bishops and Priests to commit a Sin so hideous: And so unprofitable wherefore from *Christ* time to this I do not think that the most knowing man upon Earth does know to produce six examples of the commiting of this Sin. But on the other side, no Man knows so little, but he has knowledg enough to tell him, without any rash Judgement, that it is an ordinary thing in every County and City of *England* to find divers known Bastards, and that the number of the unknown is ten times as great. And again the Name of *Iohn* is the most common of all Names: Wherefore considering the Nature of things, it is farr from all Impossibility that many of these Bastards should be called by this Name. And their Bastardism not being known, the Election may fall upon them in this County; and what happens in this County may happen in another, and so in all at once. Weaker far then this is your Argument. And yet how secure would all Men think *England* from all Misery, if we were all fully assured that no Misery should fall upon this Nation untill we did chance to have a free Parliament, consisting of three hundred Men, of which every one should be a Bastard, and every one called *Iohn*? It is great want of solidity in Judgement in so many sharp wited Men. To esteem so much such a weak Argument. And this is true prescinding from all special providence of Almighty God over his Church; but the least thought of that providence makes this light Objection vanish into smoke, and together with it the next Objection. For how easily could God put it efficaciously

in the minds of true Biſhops to meet in a ſufficient number; and when I ſee the Church Univerſal admit ſuch a Council to be a true one, I hence know that it had a ſufficient number of true Biſhops.

20. OB. 17. How ſhall I know that the Pope and Biſhops aſſembled are Chriſtians, &c. Here you diſcourſe juſt as before and the ſame anſwer anſwers you to the full. Yet for a further anſwer to both I will ſhew how wiſe your Argument is by framing juſt another like to it, thus. O! Chriſtians how do you Infallibly know that in theſe ſixteen Ages ſince the Age of Writing of the Bible, the Devil in ſome one Age did not intice as many Men as were ſufficient to corrupt the Bible; for I cannot ſee but that the Devil might eaſily make ſo many promiſes far more inticing then any ordinary motive which ſhould move Men to Baptize a Child in a falſe Form, or with want of due Intention with ſuch promiſes then the Devil might intice thoſe who did Write out the Bible, to Write falſe, juſt in ſuch and ſuch places as he ſhould ſuggeſt to them, ſo that in the ſpace of a few Ages, the multitude of the falſe Copies made them paſs for the only true ones: And how know we Infallibly that this might not have been done much after that Age in which the Devil incited the Tyrants to force all Chriſtians to give up their Bibles to be burnt, by which means the true Copies growing ſcarce, falſe ones might poſſibly be brought into common uſe by the malice of the Devil, as has been ſaid. And this example defeats alſo your next Objection. Does the Divine Providence Sleep in this manner?

21. OB. 18. How ſhall we know certainly that theſe are the Determinations of the Council? Falſe Canons may be foiſted in, and falſe Copies may be Vented. I anſwer that what has, or has not been Decreed by a Council, may as well, and far better be known certainly, then what has been Decreed by one of our Parliaments: For Councils be ſo much more notified to all, becauſe they be the Parliaments not of one, but of all Catholick Nations and ſo their deeds are more publick.

Now

Now how intolerable a Caveller were he in a Common-Wealth, who ſhould plead the not oblidging of Parliamentary Decrees by Reaſon of the Impoſſibility to know for certain what was Decreed? And which were the true Copies of the true Decrees? You would perſwade us that we cannot be ſure of that of which we ſee by daily experience we may be made as ſure as we would wiſh. The Decrees of Councils are publickly read in the Council, publickly ſubſcribed and Sealed by the Council. The Original of theſe ſubſcriptions carefully preſerved, the Copies firſt ſet forth before divers Witneſſes are confered with the Original with a publick Teſtimony (as you may ſee at the end of any Bull) *that it agrees with the Original.* Thoſe who in great Number were preſent, at the making of the Decrees do own them; no one in the Church diſclaims from them, and in caſe any ſhould, ſatisfaction would preſently be given. Our very Adverſaries Write againſt us for decreeing ſuch and ſuch things, The Fact is never denyed, but ever defended. If in any Preſs, a falſe Copy ſhould be ſet forth you will have prohibition after prohibition, and Penalty added to Penalty, untill thoſe Copies be ſuppreſſed; and all Books would be noteing, and notifing this Forgery: As we ſee in our Church by daily experience in matters of leſs conſequence, as in ſeting forth the Decrees of Cardinals, the Deciſions of that Roman Court called the *Rota*, or any other thing of this nature. Theſe evidences make every one know theſe Decrees with an unqueſtionable credibility, which, when we have, we are ſufficiently furniſhed (for as much as concerns the propoſing of the Object to embrace) with our will theſe Decrees as proceeding from the Holy Ghoſt, and teaching Verities revealed by God, upon which we immoveably fix our underſtanding, and we are reſolved by our will to fix it ſo firmly, becauſe (by Gods Grace) we have a will to proceed prudently in ſo important an affair as the Salvation of our Soul to which Heaven is offered, if She will ſubmit to believe what God thus reveals; And Hell is threatned if She will not thus ſubmit. And this offer and threats be as prudently to be

regarded as certain, as *Engliſh* Men prudently believe that there is ſuch a City as *London*. Nothing then which is not moſt Rational is required of us, it being moſt manifeſtly made credible, that this is the true command of God. Madd therefore is that Soul, which will not ſubmit. See what I ſaid in the former Section from the fifth number to the end. And alſo what I fully expreſſed, *Sect.* 16. *n.* 6. For that which you add of forging a Canon of the Council of *Nice*, I doubt not but you may twenty times have met with a ſatisfactory anſwer thereunto. See *Baronius* or *Spondan. An.* 419. *n.* 13. Tell me do forged Scriptures make the true Books of Scripture to become Fallible?

22. OB. 19. How ſhall I be aſſured of the meaning of the true Decrees when I now know them? For Learned Men have been of contrary Opinions about the meaning of them. I anſwer, that to eaſe your tender Conſcience, we will permit you not to give your aſſent to any thing, of which you are not in Conſcience manifeſtly perſwaded, that this, and only this, is the true meaning of ſuch a Council: So that you be ready prepared in mind and heart to ſubmit to the true meaning, when you ſhall come manifeſtly to know it. To more then this we preſs no Body: Only let not People fain that they do not know what they know, or eaſily may know if they will: You muſt obſerve that Councils uſe to be Aſſembled againſt ſuch and ſuch known Opinions of Sectaries: Againſt theſe they frame their Decrees ſo clearly, that the Sectaries themſelves cannot find impudency enough to deny their Opinions to be clearly condemned, and the contrary clearly defined: Wherefore we ſee by experience they never ſo much as offer to do this; But all their Forces are bent to cry down and vilifie the Authority, by which they were condemned. Some other paſſages in Councils may be found to be of an ambiguous ſenſe, and untill thoſe Paſſages be by publick Authority, further declared, we hold no Man an Heretick for not taking them in the ſenſe which ſome Men are moſt inclined to con-

conceive them to be ſpoken. Hence appears the great benefit it is to have a Living Judge, to whom all that is doubtful may be referred, and a clear Declaration procured, as it is expreſly noted in the very end of the Council of *Trent*.

23. OB. 20. What neceſſity of an Infallible Judge at all? I anſwer *Firſt*, who aſſured you that God would give no prerogative to his Church which is not preciſely neceſſary for Her very preſervation? Dr. *Ferne* profeſſes ſuch a Judge would be of ſingular benefit for the keeping of Unity in the Church, and the ending all Controverſies. See what I ſaid, *Sect.* 18. *n.* 2. I have alſo ſhewed the great neceſſity of this Judge, *Sect.* 1. *n.* 4. *&c.* True it is during the moſt Bloody Perſecution of the firſt 300 Years, the Chriſtian World could not enjoy this benefit: But I pray note what St. *Iſidore* ſaies, *Præfat. in ſuam Canonum collectionem*; where having obſerved what I now ſaid of the Perſecutions hindering the keeping of Councils, he adds, that *hence Chriſtianity was torn into diverſe Hereſies, becauſe Licenſe was not given to the Biſhops to meet in Councils untill the time of the foreſaid Emperour, (Conſtantine.)* And yet for the firſt three hundred Years Tradition of all points neceſſary could not but be ſo freſh as to make a far leſs neceſſity of Councils, then afterward when Hereſies had ſo oppoſed the firſt Traditions. But an infinite number ſticking cloſe to thoſe Traditions were not only Saved, but were glorious Martyrs in thoſe firſt three Ages.

24. Thus having anſwered your twenty Queſtions pertinent to the point of Infallibility, I come to give you ſatisfaction in an Objection wholly impertinent to this purpoſe. For it concerns not any Article defined by our Church, but private Opinions of ſome private Divines in our Church, whoſe Opinions (tho' never ſo Erronous) ought not to hinder your Converſion if you were in earneſt. Yet even in this I hope to give you ſatisfaction. Your Objection then is, *p.* 16. out of Dr. *Taylor*, endeavouring to prove our inconſiſtency with Civil Government, becauſe ſome of our Divines teach, that,

that

that which one or two, or ſome few of our Doctors ſay is Lawful, may in our Judgments be done without mortal Sin: But not only one, but many of our Doctors ſay, 'tis Lawful to Murther or Depoſe a Supream Magiſtrate that is Guilty of Hereſie, or ſuſpected of it: Therefore, *Cavete Principes concluſionem*, ſay you; but according to truer Logick you ſhould ſay, *Cavete Principes Hereſim.* I anſwer *firſt*, this Objection makes nothing againſt our Faith, but againſt private Opinions of private Divines, which Opinions he who will practiſe muſt expect publick Execution, which is ſo terrible, that it ſecures Princes more then any Preachers frightning them with fear of Sin. *Secondly*, I do nothing doubt but even thoſe Divines would ſo limit, and reſtrain their looſe Opinion to ſuch peculiar circumſtances, as would preſently clear, even their Opinion from being the leaſt inconſiſtent with the preſent Government, beſides our chearful willingneſs to take any Oath, and enter into any Bond, obliging us to the loſs of all that in this World can be loſt, if ever we ſo much as attempt the puting this Opinion in practice, which chearful willingneſs I am ſure you will find in any *Roman* Catholick Friend you have or can have in *England*. But I dare boldly ſay, that thoſe very *Doctors never* intended to ſpeak of the Lawfulneſs of Murthering an Heretical King, or Governour in a Country where that which they call Hereſie, did already overwhelm the whole Nation. I ſay nothing of their other many Reſtrictions. As that the Hereſie of ſuch a Prince, if he Lives will certainly Ruin his Country. That his Country will certainly be perſerved by his Death, and no other Way. And that for certain by killing him no very great inconveniences will follow. All theſe and other Reſtrictions even thoſe Authors will require.

25. Again *Proteſtants*, and thoſe whom they own for their Bretheren, have far more looſe Principles then theſe are, uttered even by their prime Apoſtles of their Reformation. You own the *Wiccleſians* for Bretheren: They all believe that every

every Magiſtrate does truely forfeit his Authority by Sining. You own *Luther* for your prime Patriarch, and *Calvin* for his ſecond: The firſt is notoriouſly known to have Preached Rebellion, and to have ſaid, *that the Goſpel is not Goſpel except it be divulged with tumults:* And *Calvin* ſpeaks thus *cap. 6. in Daniel. v. 22. 25. Earthly Princes do bereave themſelves of Authority, when they erect themſelves againſt God, and, we muſt rather ſpit in their Faces then obey them.* See Beza *de Jure Magiſtratuum in ſubditos;* to ſay nothing of a World of others which might be cited, whom you hold not to have Erred Fundamentally *in true* Religion, and conſequently theſe their Errors not to be Damnable. And the Author *of the end to Controverſies*, has lately in his Preface ſhewed in particular, how in every place but *England* your new Reform was brought in by Rebellion. And Dr. *Ferne*, *Sect.* 16. ſaies, *Thoſe* Churches *had but tumultuary Reformations.*

26. Having now complied with your deſire, I might claim the performance of your promiſe, but I know Gods Grace muſt rather be earneſtly Begged, then you earneſtly preſſed. Lay prejudice aſide, with other Humane Reſpects, and pray humbly to know the Truth: And then by GODS Grace, that may be done without which you will be Eternally undone.

THE

THE LAST SECTION.

The Roman Church *having been proved to be our Infallible Judge; all under pain of Damnation are bound to ſubmit to Her Judgment.*

1. IN my firſt Queſtion I proved (*n.* 1.) that there muſt be ſome certain and aſſured means to end all Controverſies or doubts which either be or can be in Religion. And (*n.* 3.) I proved that all muſt needs agree in this, that our underſtanding muſt be bound, under pain of Damnation, to ſubmit it ſelf to that Infallible Judge or Rule appointed by God Decide all neceſſary Controverſies. Now, becauſe all Faith Eſſentially conſiſts in the inward underſtanding; (which is the very Seat of true or falſe Faith,) God who looks into our interior Soul, exacts to ſee in that a ready imbracing of that Faith without which no Salvation is to be had: And therefore, as I ſaid, he ſhould not ſeriouſly deſire our Salvation unleſs he deſired that we interiorly ſhould yield, full aſſent to this one, & only ſaving Faith, of which Faith the Apoſtles ſaid, that *without it it was impoſſible to pleaſe God*, and St. *Mark*, *he who does not believe ſhall be damned*. A falſe Faith, taking the belief of a lie for a Divine Verity can help to ſave no Body. All then, to pleaſe God, and to be ſaved muſt have true Faith which eſſentially conſiſting in the interior Judgement, God would have this Judgement readily to ſubmit to the direction, or determination of that Infallible Judge which was appointed by him as the only means to bring us aſſuredly to this one true Faith. I earneſtly intreat the Reader to Read the Proof of all this in the place above cited. And *Sect.* 16. *n.* 10.

2. All this interior ſubmiſſion of underſtanding, to be due even to all that is ſaid in the Bible, and that even under pain of

of Damnation, will eaſily be granted by any Sectary, holding the Bible to be that only Rule and Direction which God has given every one, as the only means to bring him aſſuredly to the true Faith: We Catholicks do no leſs readily then they, ſubmit to the Bible as to Gods Word: But from the begining to the ending of the ſecond Queſtion, we have brought a World of evident and moſt convincing Reaſons, proving that the Scripture, by it ſelf alone, cannot be the only means appointed us by God to bring us to the aſſured knowledge of the true Faith neceſſary to Salvation; neither can it by it ſelf alone end and Decide all Controverſies about ſuch matters of Belief and practice as are wholly neceſſary to Salvation; this I have ſhewed in above four and twenty particular points: Whence it follows that God has appointed ſome other means for our certain and aſſured guidance in all theſe things. This other means I have proved through all my third Queſtion, to be the Infallible Direction of the Church, and then I paſſed to ſhew at large (through all my fourth Queſtion) that this Church, whoſe Direction is Infallible, is the *Roman* Church, taking the *Roman* Church as containing all that whole Flock of *Chriſts* Sheep adhearing to the Biſhop of *Rome*, as to their Head-Paſtor, in what place of the World ſoever they live. I have ſhewed the Tradition of this Church to be Infallible. I have ſhewed the Decrees or Definitions ſet forth in any Lawful General Council of this Church to be Infallible. Nothing of this I have ſuppoſed, but every particular, here ſpecified, I largely proved: So that I do not here, without having firſt given full Proof, Suppoſe this Roman Church to be Infallible.

3. This then ſuppoſed; I do not ſee how our very Adverſaries (convinced of the former points) can deny that all ſubmiſſion interior, and exterior, muſt of neceſſity be yielded to this Church, whoſe Directions be Infallible, and ſecured by the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt from all kind of Error: For, on the one ſide, there cannot be imagined the leaſt fear of falling

into any Error, by following our guide, who is proved to be secured from leading into Error, and on the other side, this security from Error, proceeding from the promised assistance of the Holy Ghost, given to the Church purposely to direct all Her Children, in all points of that Faith which God exacts of all to please him, and to work their Salvation by it; and this Direction being also the only safe and secure means which he has given us to this end; it is manifest that we Sin damnably if we refuse to follow it. *First*, because it is a damnable Sin not to submit to that Order of Government, which the Divine Providence has by his Wisdom and also his Soveraign Authority appointed unto all for their Direction: For, (as we at large shewed out of St. *Austen*, *Sect.* 21. *n.* 5.) if God should give a Man Commission to direct us in such points, unto which he would have all to conform, he who should refuse to submit to the Direction of this Man, should be guilty of Damnable Disobedience, not so much towards this Man, as towards God, who gave that Commission to this Man: So God (according to what has been proved) having given Commission to the Church to decide and determine all our Controversies in Faith, and to direct us in all things necessary to Salvation, as well in belief, as practice; to stand out against the Church, and not to submit to this order appointed by God, is a most damnable Sin of refractary *disobedience*.

4. *Secondly*, we have no stricter Obligation imposed by the Law of *Charity* towards our own selves, then to secure that last end for which we were Created, to wit, the Eternal Salvation of our own Souls: We are sure this cannot be done, but by pleasing God, who is not pleased but by our Profession of that only one true Faith, of which it is said *without Faith it is impossible to please God.* Hebr. 11. 6. *And he* (who with this true Faith) *believes not, shall be damned.* *Mark.* 16. *v.* 61. He then, who will not take pains and care to see himself securely settled in this true Faith (so wholly necessary to Salvation) is damnably guilty of uncharitableness

to-

towards his own Soul; whose greatest and Eternal good he neglects to procure, by neglecting to procure the only means of true Faith, by which it can only be attained. And let no Body say this means is too hard to be procured by me; for I am no Scholler but a poor Ignorant Creature. This will not excuse you for God knew well enough, that the far greater part of those, whom he Created for Eternal Salvation and obliged to work the same with fear and trembling, and for whom he did, sheding the last drop of his Blood, so to purchase a greater plenty of Graces for them; this God, I say, knew well enough that the greater part of those, for which he did and suffered so much, were Poor Ignorant People: And therefore he had been no earnest Lover of Souls if he had not ordained some means so easie, even to the Ignorant, that they thereby might effectually be brought to that true Faith, which he so rigorously exacts of all under pain of Damnation. This means, and this only means, I have proved at large to be the Infallible guidance and direction of the Church, whose Traditions and Decrees in all points necessary are so inculcated by every Preacher and Catechist of this Church, that it is impossible for any one desirous of Instruction, to live in Ignorance of them; impossible to live according to them and not to be saved. *For this Commandement which I command thee this day, is not hidden from thee, neither is it far off. It is not in Heaven, that thou shouldest say, who shall go up for us to Heaven, and bring it down unto us, that we may hear it, and do it. Neither is it beyond the Sea that thou shouldest say who shall go over the Sea for us and bring it unto us, that we may hear it, and do it. But the Word is very nigh unto thee. Deutr.* 30. v. We exact not the knowledge of Greek, and Hebrew, and the use of near twenty Rules more as I have shewed our Adversaries to do, *Sect.* 7 *n.* 6. But we exact only the following this so known Direction of the Church, *A way so direct that no Fool can Err in it.* And we

having so groundedly seen that this is the Direction given us by God to follow, we do not proceed blindly by following it with all submission, but no blindness is greater, then in an unknown way, through which of necessity we must pass at our Eternal peril if we miss, to refuse the following of an Infallible guide proved for us and offered to us in this passage, and rather to yield our selves over to a confessed Fallible Direction. What greater blindness?

5. *Dr. Ferne* indeed, and Protestants discourse otherwise of the submission due to the Church, but it is upon the false supposition that She is Fallible, without they mean to discourse only of their own Church, and then they may truely suppose Her as Fallible as they please: And She being so Fallible, they most unreasonably are still exacting of us even by most rigorous sequestration of all our Estates, and by what other Penalties they think fit, to leave that Church which we so groundedly hold to be the only infallible Guide appointed us by God himself, as the only means to direct us securely to our Eternal Salvation and to yield exterior conformity to their own new Moulded Church, which they all confess and profess to be Fallible: Which is to say, you must be undone in your Estate, without you conform your selves to that New Reformation of ours, which *perhaps* is true. For we do not challenge Infallible Truth to what we teach, we being Fallible Men, and our Interpretation of Gods Word being only Fallible; yet Infallibly we will undo you, if you will not follow us. And yet if you do follow us *perhaps* you may be undone Eternally; for we cannot say that our Church is Infallible in what She teaches contrary to yours. She may therefore deceive you to embrace really for a Divine Verity, For you must be forced to embrace a Doctrine declared by Fallible Interpretations out of Scripture which Interpretations the far greater and the more Learned part of this present Age rejects as Heretical, and which as such were rejected by almost all visible Christianity for this last Thousand years, and which will perhaps shortly be

be rejected by us. For it is ordinary with us (I ſpeak what truly Proteſtants may ſpeak,) to reject that to day, which yeſterday we cryed up for a Divine Verity.

6. Now all this being ſo truly ſpoken, I do not ſee what needs more to be ſpoken, to vindicate and juſtifie our moſt juſt Recuſancy in refuſing to ſubmit to ſo prepoſterous proceedings of Men when they, providing us no better ſecurity enforce us to refuſe due ſubmiſſion to that Infallible Direction of the Holy Catholick Church, moſt orderly appointed by God to bring us ſecurely to that end for which he made us, to which God of his Infinite Mercy vouchaſe to bring us all.

7. And thus having ended what I had to ſay of this moſt important matter; I muſt crave my Readers pardon for enlarging my ſelf ſo profuſely. For I am wholly of the mind of that dear Friend of St. *Auſten*, called *Nebridius*, who was uſed to ſay: *That in a great Queſtion, he hated a ſhort Anſwer, Aug. to.* 1. *Epiſt.* 23. *ad Bonif.* Wherefore in this Queſtion of Queſtions brevity, might well be accounted hateful.

FINIS.